

L500
N35
1761
110.2

Hearing of The
SENATE FACT FINDING COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

---oOo---

Financing of a Program for the Acquisition
and Development of Beach, Park,
Recreation and Historic Sites ; *hearings*

Held In
Room 1138, State Building
Los Angeles, California



---oOo---

Monday, December 11, 1961
10:00 O'clock, A.M.

---oOo---

A P P E A R A N C E S

---oOo---

Senator J. Howard Williams, Chairman

Senator Stanley Arnold

Senator Aaron W. Quick

Senator Ronald G. Cameron

Senator Fred Farr

Ford B. Ford, Executive Secretary

Also Present:

Assemblywoman Pauline Davis

Assemblyman Gaffney

Senator Sturgeon

I N D E X

<u>Witnesses:</u>	<u>Page</u>
Mrs. Gertrude G. Harriman, State Park Commission	7
Charles DeTurk, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation	10
N. B. Keller, Joint Legislative Budget Committee	26
Harold Crowe, M.D., Sierra Club	41
F. M. McLaughlin, Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles	44
Norman Johnson, Director of Parks and Recreation, County of Los Angeles	50
George Hjelte, Director of Parks and Recreation, City of Los Angeles	53
Frank DePasquale, Elsinore, California	66
Dr. Pearl Chase, Santa Barbara National Conference on State Parks	68
Beula Edmiston, Southern California Chapter of Nature Conservancy	76
Lachlan Richards, Chief, Division of Small Craft Harbors	81
Raymond Nesbit, Coordinator for Wildlife Conservation Board	84
Helen Roark, Farm Owner, San Luis Obispo	87
J. H. Tedder, Western Council of Trailer Clubs	95
Burt L. Anderson, Executive Secretary, California Park and Recreation Society	105
Oliver Pryor, Secretary-Treasurer, Wilsona Gardens Mutual Water Company	107
Edward H. Walker, Park Superintendent, Riverside County	115
Dr. Henry M. Weber, Inyo, California	116
Ned Rogoway, Planning Director of San Luis Obispo County	120
Mrs. Henry T. Read for Lloyd Tevis, Chairman Desert Protective Council	128
Ray Henning	132
John Tyler, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs	135
Dr. Frank Harnett, President, Long Beach Trailer Club	142
Elmer T. Worthy, Trailer Clubs of America	144
Alexander Deutsch	147

Monday, December 11, 1961, 10:00 o'clock, A.M.

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Will the Committee please be in order. Mrs. Davis, I would like to invite you to come and sit with the Committee, please, and Mr. Gaffney. Are there other Assemblymen here? All right.

In opening up this meeting, which is a meeting of the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources, I have a prepared statement which I would like to read and I'll introduce the members of the Committee. This is the second in a series of three hearings of the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources held to consider the needs for and suggested implementation of the proposed bond issue for the acquisition and development of beach and park recreation and historic sites. The first hearing was held in Sacramento on November 29 to receive the presentations and suggestions of State agencies. The hearing today and the one to be held in San Francisco on December 13, day after tomorrow, are primarily for the benefit of individuals, organizations, and other levels of government to make their wishes known on this subject.

However, realizing that all of you in the audience should become aware of the policies and the responsibility of State agencies so that you can appraise their policies, the Committee has asked that certain of them summarize their initial presentations. To date almost everyone appearing before this Committee has attested to the need for more recreational opportunities. How best to

allocate available funds and the proceeds of a bond issue to meet these needs has not received the same general agreement. It will be this Committee's objective to recommend an equitable program to the Legislature based upon all testimony presented. You will note that the agenda has been prepared to reflect a time schedule so that all those expressing a desire to testify may be assured the opportunity to do so. If there are others in the audience who wish to make a presentation, please note on the registration slip and hand it to the Sergeant-at-Arms. Every effort will be made to receive your comments.

This hearing is being reported. Those having written statements are requested to hand a copy to the Reporter and additional copies to the Sergeant-at-Arms for distribution.

Now, I would like to introduce the members of the Committee. I'm going to start on my far right here, Senator Sturgeon, from San Luis Obispo County, who while not a member of this Committee is very much interested in this recreational program and I have asked him to sit with the Committee. On my immediate right is Senator Aaron Quick from El Centro, a member of the Committee. I am Howard Williams from Porterville. On my immediate left is Mr. Ford B. Ford, the Executive Secretary of the Committee. Next to him is Senator Stanley Arnold from Susanville. Next to him is Senator Fred Farr from Monterey, and then Senator Ronald Cameron who is the author of the constitutional amendment and the bills which we are hearing today and I'll call on him in just a moment, and at the far end on my left is Mrs. Pauline Davis, Assemblywoman

from Portola, representing several counties in the north, and she and Mr. Gaffney are members of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee and we have asked that they sit with the Committee today. Miss Alice Book is the Official Reporter here.

And I'm going to ask that Senator Cameron make a statement here in view of the fact this legislation is legislation that he sponsored during the last session. Senator.

SENATOR CAMERON: Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Colleagues in the Legislature, I do not intend to repeat the long statement I made in Sacramento. I want to say two things: First, the bill as introduced by myself and a number of other legislators is only a vehicle. It was never intended to pass in that form. It was a vehicle to call attention to a real serious problem. It was understood at the time that it would go into interim for study because it is too important for the people of this State to pass without thorough public hearings and thorough study by the Legislature, and that is what we are doing now. Second, the reason I introduced it is because many of you feel that one of the pressing demands in California today is to buy land for recreational, historic, scenic and other purposes of a like nature, that if we don't take action now, we may find that that land is forever gone. We know if we look at the Los Angeles coastline that if 25 or 50 years ago we had moved ahead we would not now have to be paying \$1500. a front foot. At Lake Tahoe we are confronted with a similar situation. It's almost gone as far as public use is concerned.

We don't want that repeated. We want to preserve for the

future these areas of great scenic and recreational value and for that reason the legislation is introduced.

There are a number of principles and some arguments concerning how best to do this and this is what we are here for. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, Senator. Now, the first person I wish to call, the first witness is Mrs. Gertrude G. Harriman, member of the State Park Commission. I'll ask the witnesses as they come up if they will please be seated and be comfortable at this head table right here and give their name and their official position for the Reporter and then proceed with their statement. Mrs. Harriman.

MRS. HARRIMAN: I'm Gertrude Harriman, member of the State Park Commission. I have written what I had to say because I don't always have terminal facilities. I know it will take three minutes. I live in the country. I took it out on the back lot and read it aloud for time. A blue jay gave a great squawk and flew away. So I trust that won't happen to the Committee.

I have been a member for four years of the State Park Commission and already I am being indicted for not acquiring land for park purposes when land was cheap.

The use of land, the need for and the competition for land and the attitudes toward land have changed that fast. Industry, highways, reservoirs and the lands adjacent thereto, agriculture and the Armed Forces, the latter account for over 30 million acres

in the United States and California's portion is large due to the nature of our State itself. I have left housing toward the end of the list because of the urban extension, the metropolitan sprawl because California's problem is exaggerated in that regard. It is the climate and it is the sunshine.

While there are many instances of housing going vertical and extensive apartment building, in the main our people who are accustomed to it and are newcomers who are seeking it want elbow room horizontally which, of course, requires more land per person. Also they want out, beaches, mountains, deserts. They aren't interested in being a statistic showing how much overusage and how much turnaway and how much square feet per person per day is good park planning. They want a place to go. That's especially true in the south. Volume of population, mobility, leisure time and money to spend have increased the desire and the demand for outdoor recreation farther and farther from the driving, rushing, noisy urgency and tension in today's living. That again is particularly true of the metropolitan area.

Recreation is big business. Some charts show it fifth place in industry, some nearer the top than that. Communities are increasingly aware of its effect on the economy and acknowledging the same which used not to be as much as it is now.

Land for parks is becoming scarce, is scarce, and the price is mounting in breath-taking leaps. It appears that acquisition is imperative. Development can always follow, but you must first have the land. The State knows exactly what can be done with how

much money.

Thanks to Governor Brown's interest and instructions, the Park Commission, the Division of Beaches and Parks, assisted by the Department of Finance and others have drawn up a five-year continuing plan for the whole State of acquisition and development which is clear-cut, yet flexible enough to allow for changes in conditions. Forward-looking ideas for out-of-door recreation on a large scale seem not to be the place for determined or militant sectionalism. This is all California-concerned. The mountain men go to the sea. The deep fishermen seek out the peaks. In the past I'll admit Southern California was something of a step-child. It's doing a little bit better now.

As an example, I could use San Bernardino County which particularly deserves attention because of its magnificent potential and its late start.

Why a bond issue? Because the people should be given a real chance to make up their minds and to express their wishes. We tell them how many children they are going to have in 1980 and what they are going to do with them and where they can't put them, but that is all very well. That's our job, but at the same time all the people must say what it is they want. Does California want parks and is she willing to pay for them? That's the vital question as I see it.

The need for prompt decision is urgent. The State has now seven more residences than when I began this statement, but there is no more land. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, Mrs. Harriman. Are there any questions by members of the Committee of Mrs. Harriman? Thank you very much. We appreciate having you here and having your valuable testimony. Now, the next person I want to call on is the Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation, Mr. Charles DeTurk. Give your name and your official position for the record and then you proceed with your statement.

MR. DE TURK: My name is Charles DeTurk and I am Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation of the State of California.

I will not repeat my testimony as presented recently in your first hearing in Sacramento. At that time I told you that our program totals to \$163,000,000--which would provide nearly 14,000 basic camp units, as well as boat launching facilities, picnic areas, swimming beaches, and the myriad of developments provided in our State Parks.

However, we are not seeking the total amount. We believe our capital outlay construction program can be met through the standard budget process--say at the rate of \$7,000,000 a year, which would be about \$4,000,000 more than our capital outlay construction program today. All acquisition would be through bond money. What we seek in advocating the bond proposal is sufficient moneys to acquire land--park lands, which are scarce, very scarce. And acquire them now while we are financially able to do

so.

This year, for property along the Santa Monica coast, we are paying nearly \$1,500 a front foot. As rich as California may or may not be, that is a lot of money for one foot of beach for 16,000,000 people. There are other properties--beach, desert and mountain--available and of park quality. And at far lower prices. Let us hope they are there when you and the voters give us the green light. I say this because when we released our program early this year, it wasn't one week before bulldozers were manned by subdividers and certain desirable areas were gone. Southern Californians--Californians--want open space, not a park in urban atmosphere. This statement is substantiated by the fact that as much as 70 percent of our occupancy in some Northern California parks--at Lake Tahoe and the Redwoods 900 miles away--are Southern Californians. This is greater in proportion to the population division.

For the record here are the areas in Southern California in which we are interested and propose to acquire if all goes well:

In the south coastal area in Orange, Los Angeles, San Luis Obispo, Monterey and Santa Barbara Counties we would like to acquire 16,000 acres at a cost of 19 and a half million dollars. These areas would be capable--

SENATOR FARR: Does he have a copy of that?

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Do you have a copy of your statement?

MR. DE TURK: I thought your Committee had copies of it. I have a copy of it. I believe you do have.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Yes, they have been passed out.

MR. DE TURK: These 16,000 acres would provide for 2,550 new campsites on Southern California beaches. Now, this actually is 50 percent of the total campsites we have now in the California State Park System. The cost of the development of these areas would be about 8 million dollars.

In our existing parks which include Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Ventura, San Diego and Orange Counties we would like to add about 5,000 acres to our present holdings at a cost of approximately 13 million dollars. This would provide an additional 1,470 campsites and the total development cost of these additional acres plus development where we are behind in our present parks in this region would be 10 million 600 thousand dollars. So our proposal on the south coast totals 32 and a half million dollars worth of land acquisition for 21,000 acres and 18 million dollars of development including 4,000 new campsites which would exactly double the number of campsites in the entire State Park System as of today.

In the Southern California mountain and desert areas we would like to add 364,000 acres, the majority of this being in the mountain areas at a cost of 12 million dollars, and our developments in this same region would amount to 9 million dollars,

providing 2700 additional campsites, so in Southern California our total program would amount to 40 million dollars for acquisition, 28 million dollars for development, and it would provide 6,700 new campsites which is 150 percent of our current total.

Now, I had explained to you in Sacramento the extent of the total acquisition and development program which was roughly some 90 million dollars for land acquisition and some 70 million dollars for development of both new and existing properties.

Director DeWitt Nelson of the Department of Conservation told you in Sacramento about the needs for both land and development in the California Park System. To review that very briefly, in 1958, the date of the surveys that were made, camping facilities were 30 percent deficient to meet the current need. Picnicking facilities were 30 percent deficient. Boating facilities were 50 percent deficient and swimming facilities were 35 percent deficient.

Now, the 1980 need which has been presented both in the outdoor recreation plan and by our own figures, show a minimum requirement by 1980 of the demands for various outdoor activities. The records show that camping in California by 1980 will have an increased demand of 430 percent; picnicking, 380 percent; boating, 600 percent; and swimming by 300 percent. So when I have told you that we will about double our total camping, that means we will be 200 percent and will not quite have met the total need as represented by the various surveys that have been made.

Senator O'Sullivan asked me some questions and although he

isn't here, I think the Committee is entitled to what answers I have been able to develop in a week. One was, how many people use the State Park Systems, and that I cannot give you with any degree of accuracy in the individual number of people who visit parks. I can give it to you only in the number of days that people were in parks and this would be much like a church attendance or a theater attendance figure because many people went more than once and the total attendance in California State Park areas on the lands that we own and that we manage is 24 million. On the lands that the counties or cities manage for use, basically Southern California beaches, is an additional 55 million users. We simply have not been able to develop a way to identify individuals who use parks. I would feel that the number of Californians that use our State Park System would be somewhere between 30 and 50 percent of the total Californians, but that is hardly an educated guess. It is just simply my personal estimate.

Senator O'Sullivan also asked about what percentage of our land was developed for public use. That again is a two-sided question because some of our highest development is simply the preservation of the scenic grandeur for which the park was acquired, and when a thousand acres of virgin Redwoods is looked at, its highest development is still to contain 1,000 acres of virgin Redwoods so we would not class that as lands that could be developed that are not developed. I would say to you that according to our best estimates, the amount of land capable of developing for picnicking, parking, swimming, camping in our present State Park area is

about 70 percent developed, and we should have a good 30 percent of developable land left in our present system which may be developed. For instance, for your information our figures show that if we have a 500 acre beach, that we may afford to develop 250 acres of it in facilities, rest rooms, baths, houses, access roads, parking areas, camping areas, things of that nature, leaving approximately half of the beach area, the sand area for use of the people after they have arrived at the park, either set up their camp or parked their car in a parking lot. We feel that we couldn't go much tighter than this else there would be nothing there for them to use after they had arrived. The Committee also asked me to be more accurate in my figure on the cost of operating the park system, if it includes the lands and developments which we have proposed to you. Currently, in 1961, the 1961-62 budget provides for 8 million dollars of operating cost of our present system. If we added the total acres and the total developments including the doubled camping facilities that we have proposed, our operating cost should be a total of 13 million 250 thousand dollars or up 4 and a quarter million dollars rather than the 3 that I mentioned to you in last week's hearing.

This figure in dollars, of course, will go up or down depending on whether the economy goes up or down, whether wages go up or down and whether the value of the dollar goes up or down. It would be up 4 and a quarter million dollars over today's 8 million dollars, if we had it all ready to use in 1962. I think I discussed with you very briefly the fact that it is not always

easy to locate parks where we or you might like to locate them. Too often they must be located where they are. We find them rather than build them.

Now, in the recreational category we can build recreational areas, but we still must find the land on which to do it. The County of Los Angeles in my opinion has done a magnificent job in this part of the State in doing that very thing, in looking at the recreational developments that they have made back of some of their flood control dams such as the Whittier Narrows Dam, for instance, that I looked at last week. They realize that occasionally whether it is once every 50 years or once every hundred years, whatever the flood cycle is, their total development will be under water. Nevertheless, they feel that it is good business and I would agree with them, to put in the developments that they want and can use for many years as they may be used until they are flooded and then they can be rehabilitated. That is one method of acquiring at relatively low cost and developing recreational areas in heavily-populated parts of California.

I did discuss with you the economic value that parks have to communities and to the State. I think it is important that we keep in front of us the fact that the basic assessed value of land around a good park development goes up and in most cases compensates or more than compensates for what has been removed from the tax base. I think it is good to remember that in California recreational travel accounts for 171 million dollars of gasoline tax. I think that is a good figure to remember when we

figure the value of outdoor recreational areas. I think it is well for us to remember that tourist travel in California in 1960 amounted to 850 million dollars which was 10 times the total value of the best year of the Gold Rush. It is a good business, a good economic business that lends a high degree of culture and a high degree of pleasure and a high degree of entertainment to the Californians who participate in it.

We have developed--I would rather not read it to you simply because I'm not too sure of the accuracy of it, but we have started to work out a development on the actual percentage of out-of-state people using any particular park, and I would simply high-light it like this to state that the Jedediah Smith State Park in Del Norte County has a 29 percent out-of-state use, that the Colusa-Sacramento River State Park on Sacramento River serving local boaters basically had no out-of-state use during the period of the survey and that the other is varied from 23 percent or 24 percent down to 1 percent or 2 percent, a great amount of the factors being how far are these areas from the major highways, what facilities do they provide?

Interestingly enough, the historic areas, the Missions, the town of Columbia, the Pueblo of Los Angeles, any of the things with historical value, have an exceedingly high out-of-state use. Apparently our history gets around over the United States. It is interesting to people and consequently they do visit these areas when they are in the State of California.

We'll look over this survey much more carefully, but we

will try to submit it to you by your San Francisco hearing in a form that at least I could stick up for that I could believe in, and I would not hand it to you whether it was good or bad if I personally couldn't believe in it, the same as I would expect you to. I think that is the review that I feel is sufficient unless there are some questions you would like to ask me.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: I thank you very much, Mr. DeTurk. Any questions from the members of the Committee? Senator Cameron.

SENATOR CAMERON: Mr. DeTurk, just for the record, because we discussed it partly in Sacramento, your estimates that you gave of the over-use or the lack of facilities varying from 30 percent to 35 percent in different categories, is as I remember a very conservative one based on one thing alone, the actual specific number of cars that come in and the park attendant says, "No, we have no room for you, go somewhere else," isn't that true?

MR. DE TURK: Yes, sir, that is exactly correct.

SENATOR CAMERON: That doesn't cover the people who see it is crowded and drive on?

MR. DE TURK: And the signs put up at the front that say "Camp ground full." Anybody who sees it and believes it is not counted as a turn-away because we don't know he is there.

SENATOR CAMERON: So 30 percent is a bare minimum?

MR. DE TURK: That is right.

SENATOR CAMERON: And it doesn't cover the literally

thousands that go in my district in the Sierras because there aren't the facilities and camp all over the place, trespass, create fire and health hazards and pollute the streams? It doesn't cover that?

MR. DE TURK: It doesn't cover those people at all.

SENATOR CAMERON: I think a hundred percent would be closer to accuracy.

MR. DE TURK: My personal opinion would agree with you completely because the same thing happens at Hearst Castle. The sign at the highway says when the tours are full for the day, and there are still some people who come in and inquire and they are counted, but those who simply pause, look and drive on, we can have no record of that group of people. Our records also show, Senator Cameron, that we have used our camping areas 20 percent to 25 percent over capacity on crowded week-ends, that is, if we have capacity for 100 automobiles in a camp grounds, we have frequently had 125 automobiles in there. Our people have done their best to take care of what might have been their most urgent needs or at least to get them in as thickly as they possibly can before they actually start to turn away people.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? Senator Farr.

SENATOR FARR: Mr. DeTurk, the development of local and regional parks is a great help to the State Park System, is it not?

MR. DE TURK: It certainly is.

SENATOR FARR: And takes a strain off the State Parks?

MR. DE TURK: I think this Los Angeles County is perhaps the highest example of that. If they did not have the program that they do have, the State Park System could simply not touch the need. I believe it very strongly and I believe further that they should be highly complimented for having a charter amendment on their own ballot next November to allow themselves to tax themselves 149 million dollars worth for park facilities in Los Angeles County. Without that kind of work it would be, I believe, totally impossible for the State of California to meet the entire need. There are other areas that do a good job of this and in the Small Craft Harbors program, if you have an opportunity while you are in this part of the State to look at what San Diego has done and what Los Angeles has done, and there is another real good one right south or downcoast of Los Angeles in the King Harbor project where these people have done a magnificent job of meeting their needs with their own funds, their own initiative and have not found it necessary to ask anybody to help them at all.

SENATOR FARR: With that in mind, you have given consideration to the possibility of taking some of the bond money and making a part of it available to local communities and to counties for the development of perhaps county parks and regional parks with the thought in mind that your dollar would stretch that much farther if the State put up part of it and the county or several counties in developing a region park would put up some of the money.

SENATOR CAMERON: Senator, could I answer the question, because I have worked on that. Would that be all right? And we didn't mention this here, but at the opening of the meeting in Sacramento, I pointed out that my primary interest was in the State-wide development, but I had a secondary interest in the local or regional concept. The cooperative concept by counties is to provide primarily day use facilities, and it has been suggested and been under consideration by a number that an additional 50 million dollars be put out for that purpose, Senator. However, I felt that this program, these procedures and these suggestions should come from the people concerned, rather than having the Legislature say, "This is it." We want the county supervisors, the recreation people, to sponsor and bring what they think is right and necessary to us and incidentally also there are some bills to facilitate that type of development, and I think Mr. McLaughlin here today may have some specific suggestions. I know I talked to him last March about it. I hope so anyway, but that has been considered. That is being handled I think and being considered by other groups that I think we will hear from, Senator.

SENATOR FARR: I would like to get Mr. DeTurk's expression on that subject.

MR. DE TURK: We, too, had considered this. We had considered it primarily since it was mentioned at great length in the outdoor recreation plan. I do know that New York State has had some problems in the administration of its recent 75

million dollar bond issue for parks in the way it has made money available to the counties. That was provided for in their bond issue and their machinery to do it has caused a sort of a grab-bag problem. That may happen with New Jersey's new 60 million dollar one, although they have had the advantage of watching New York to see what they could learn from them. We had discussed this on the theory that if State money might be advanced to counties that needed it to do their proper regional planning so they and we would know what should be done in the area and then grants made for acquisition of land within that program with a firm agreement by the county that they would further develop and then operate the areas rather than a matching program. Simply their attempt to operate and development would be their matching. That would be it. Granting acquisition money seems to be the best machinery that we have been able to devise to work out a program that would give honest assistance where it is needed.

Now, it is very true that the wealthy counties which could match like Los Angeles or Orange or San Diego or San Francisco, they have a problem. We know that, but the counties where the people want to go for recreational activities which might be Mono County or Alpine County or maybe Plumas County or Siskiyou County, which do not have the financial background to do this would never be able to match. That being the case, we simply would never be able to have them pick up any share of the burden at all if we confine it to a matching type program. I do believe these counties

would have the energy and the ambition to carry on a development program and certainly to carry on an operating program, so I think we would have to watch that, that angle. The State has learned a great deal from the Small Craft Harbors program as you know. I would not have mentioned it, but it was mentioned in the testimony in Sacramento and then this does give me sort of a sneaky way to get in an answer that in the Small Craft Harbors program they are less than three-tenths of 1 percent behind in their interest payments owed them by other governmental subdivisions. They are not behind at all in their repayment of interest and their bonds sell for the least interest rate of any bonds that the State of California sells. They are the cheapest bonds and I think that reflects excellent credit on the reliability of that particular program. It did have some rough spots and I think that we have learned together how to avoid those rough spots in that program and I think that would be of great assistance in avoiding the rough spots in any other program we got into.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions of this witness? Mrs. Davis.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS: Mr. DeTurk, in this local concept, is it not true that the areas in the State of California that the people may be more desirous of attending as far as relaxation, as you stipulated, would not be in the financial position of matching, have you analyzed the possibility of the situation that the only financial obligation that perhaps they would be able to care for would be the operation and maintenance and not the development?

MR. DE TURK: Well, that is perfectly possible, Mrs. Davis, because although Alpine County is full of beautiful, delightful landscape and wonderful recreation opportunities, I don't see how those 300 people could build very much, really, I don't. But the land is there and that is where the rest of California likes to go, and I think the same holds true in many of the counties in your district, doesn't it?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS: Well, this is true. Now, would it not be better as far as this local concept to more or less leave it with existing agencies and entities that have already maintained a relationship with the boards of supervisors that have this responsibility?

MR. DE TURK: Certainly.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS: I feel, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, that in this local concept, we might give some thought to leaving it with an entity of State government that has had this responsibility and I have also found from personal experience that this local endeavor must be approached rather slowly. If you try to urge your way into the participation of the local viewpoint, you might find some boards of supervisors shying away from it a little bit. I think it is a slow process. Some of the programs that we have under the Wildlife Conservation Board have just been working out very well and I think the public relations that that particular entity has created on this local concept has been magnificent and we might certainly take into consideration leaving it within that scope.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions of this witness? Thank you very much, Mr. DeTurk. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Mr. Anderson--

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: May I ask Mr. DeTurk a question?

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Yes, go ahead, Mr. Gaffney.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Mr. DeTurk, in the acquisition of the bond issue voted at the last election in San Francisco was it contemplated that the Park and Recreation Commission at some later date might take that park over for a State Park?

MR. DE TURK: Yes, sir, and I would say that that has caused some confusion in some people's minds. The fact that the Fort Funston tract of something over 100 acres, I believe 116 acres, of beautiful beach without any highway through it--the highway is behind it in this case--has been recommended and has been approved by the State Park Commission as a part of the State Park program.

Now, the reason San Francisco burdened itself with a bond issue to acquire it is because it must be acquired from the General Services Administration within a matter of months or it is sold to the highest bidder. Now, the State had no money that it could draw on to buy this property no matter how good it was. So San Francisco did pass a bond issue to raise the money to buy it and the money that they are paid in reimbursement by the State when the State acquires it will simply be to retire their bond issue. They have done the job of holding onto it. We would like to combine

it with the Fort Funston beach in going straight down the coast on into San Mateo beach project so we have a long strip of public California beach in that part of the State, and I wouldn't want to look at it as a 116-acre tract of land. It is a piece of many-mile-long beach project.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: San Francisco voted the bond issue or that land would be just another subdivision?

MR. DE TURK: That would be gone now.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: And it would be lost as a wilderness area for California for all time.

MR. DE TURK: And I do believe that its school, its water, its sewage, its fire and its streets would cost the City of San Francisco considerably more than they will derive in taxes from the same piece of property.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. Any other questions? Thank you very much, Mr. DeTurk. Several have come in unbeknown to the Chairman and said they would like to appear this morning. I'm not sure that we can get them on in the morning, but we will do our best and if anyone cannot be here and we can't get them on the agenda, they can always file their statement with the Secretary and it will be part of the transcript and part of the Committee's record. The next person I want to call on is N. B. Keller, Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

MR. KELLER: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is N. B. Keller, member of the staff of the

Legislative Analyst. I would like to briefly reiterate the position of the Legislative Analyst as given to this Committee in Sacramento last week and to expand on some points that we don't think were touched on or at best too briefly. If we accept the premise that the growth of the population of California in the next three or four decades is going to continue at about the same rate and that the rate of growth and the availability of leisure time will continue as it has thus far and that this growth will require a substantial expansion in the real estate of the State Park System, and if we further accept the premise that many highly desirable sites, desirable from the standpoint of scenic beauty or recreational potential may be physically destroyed in the very near future or may be inflated in price out of all proportion to what we can afford to pay by reason of developments surrounding these sites, then we believe that a bond issue to forestall these eventualities is entirely supportable and justifiable, because in effect this would be a one-time expenditure for a permanent investment.

However, if we are not to contradict these premises by our actions and if we are to get the maximum use from any bond issue of whatever size is decided upon, we believe that the funds provided must be expended very rapidly in order to acquire the kind of properties that are in these dangers. At the previous meeting there was some expression that this might be a 10-year program. It seems to us that this definitely contradicts the basic premise that much of the property is in danger of being lost. We believe

that whatever is expended should be on the basis of a well-defined plan with clear priorities based on these possibilities of loss due either to physical destruction or excessive inflation in value and that, if you will, it might almost be a crash program in which all of the State's capabilities will be used to the utmost possibly by depending even more heavily than we do now on the Division of Highways acquisition forces, possibly even by contracting with outside organizations to do some of the work for us in order to get these sites bought as quickly as possible so that we do the two things we mention, save them from destructive loss and buy them as cheaply as is possible and thereby get the most use of the money.

Now, while we have not recommended any specific amount for a bond issue, nor are we prepared to do so now, if we use the sum that has been spoken about, 100 million dollars, we would like to point out this important fact, that if you think in terms of a straight line retirement of this debt for a 40-year bond issue, you have to provide about 3 and a half million dollars each year just for debt service and retirement. If it is a 25-year issue, it would be in excess of 4 and a half million dollars a year. Now, this would have to be provided as I say on the average every year of that period starting from the beginning if you do it in terms of a sinking fund. This would mean, of course, that the funds that are now being provided out of general revenues for acquisition would still be needed to service this debt. If the bond issue is merely to serve as a technique for balancing the budget

by displacing other things, we believe this is poor financing.

We think that the general tax structure of the State should be prepared to carry the burden of financing the bond issue and also of financing the development of these properties. I would like to point out, and I think this is a logical analogy, that most private corporate endeavors generate a great deal of their own capital funds by retention of their properties and revenues and only when they are faced with problems of relatively rapid expansion do they go into debt, and I think the same is true of the State in that the annual revenues of the State and its general revenue structure represents the same funds that any private endeavor receives in the course of its business, and to the extent possible they should carry some of the capital outlay burden. It is for this reason that we feel that development should not be part of this bond issue, that development, particularly in park systems where the kinds of developments have a relatively short life and need to be built over in relatively short periods, should be on a more or less pay-as-you-go basis. They should proceed as the need is generated by the growth of the population and the demand and they should be paid for as our economy expands out of our tax revenues. I might also point out that it is entirely possible to consider that the rate of development might conceivably be stepped up by asking the people who use the developments to share a larger burden than they are now sharing, a larger part of the burden than they are now sharing. This could, of course, materially speed up the development program. I believe

this is all we have to say at this time.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness?

SENATOR ARNOLD: I have a question. Mr. Keller, what type of recreation facilities do you refer to that require relatively frequent replacement?

MR. KELLER: Well--

SENATOR ARNOLD: On a comparatively short term?

MR. KELLER: A shorter term than say a large building of this type, for example--the developments in the State Park of picnic tables and facilities of that type, the rest facilities, the road system and the like are replaced a lot more frequently and a lot more rapidly than most of us realize. They are not replaced in the sense they are torn down and physically replaced. Their maintenance costs are high and they are in a sense being replaced constantly by being rebuilt because of the fact that they are largely not designed to last any great number of years, 20 years or something of that order.

SENATOR ARNOLD: Well, those are pretty much a part of every recreation facility then, aren't they?

MR. KELLER: Yes.

SENATOR ARNOLD: Then, there aren't any separate things you have reference to?

MR. KELLER: No, I mean that all of the things that go into a State Park program in terms of development have a relatively short life-expectancy as compared to bridges and big buildings and that sort of thing, college campuses and so on.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? Senator Farr.

SENATOR FARR: Mr. Keller, you said something about the users of the State Parks paying a greater share. Do you mean that the fees in the parks should be raised?

MR. KELLER: Yes, sir.

SENATOR FARR: What do you think they should be?

MR. KELLER: Senator, I don't think I would be prepared to guess at any figure as to what they ought to be, except that I might point out that there are many developments privately operated that are similar in character to our State Parks, for example, beach developments that have trailer facilities and that sort of thing that charge substantially more than the State Park Systems do and give substantially less in the way of service and general appearance. There are people that make use of these and are apparently satisfied now to pay the higher tab. Sometimes they do it under duress because they can't get into a State Park, this is true, but nevertheless they do pay it. As I say, I would^{not} be prepared to say what the fees ought to be but we do believe that they could be substantially higher without distressing the using public and would definitely help this development picture move ahead more rapidly.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Senator Farr, did you have your question answered? Senator Sturgeon and then I'll recognize Senator Arnold again.

SENATOR STURGEON: Maybe Senator Arnold should go

first.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Go ahead, Senator.

SENATOR STURGEON: Mr. Keller, Mr. DeTurk testified here a short time ago that some 30 percent of the land that is in State ownership now in the State Park System is undeveloped. Now, if we go along with your idea that all of this bond money should be spent for acquisition only, do you have any idea how long it might be before we would be able to start developing the newly-acquired land?

MR. KELLER: Well, Senator, I would first have to say this, if we are thinking in terms of acquiring properties because of the dangers of losing them, thinking in terms of acquiring them very rapidly, I don't think it would be either practical or wise to develop them all because we then find ourselves with an excess in many instances. I think that we would probably be wise in buying many of these properties in advance of their real need and making some interim use of them that would be compatible with their preservation. For example, in acquiring a given piece of property that is now being used to some extent for grazing, it might be leased back to the original owner or it might be leased to others to do exactly the same thing until such time as the need for its actual use develops and then we can move in and do this. As far as this 30 percent of the developable portion of our present system being undeveloped, this we believe should and can be stepped up by use of current revenues and as

I said possibly by the use of increased fees. But as to how long it would take before you would develop all these acquisitions, this would be hard to say. It would be simply a matter of the rate of growth of the State and the rate of demand for these. I can see many instances in areas that I can think of where it is desirable to buy the property now because we might lose it, actually lose it physically because of a subdivision, where the actual need for use right there is relatively low because there are other parks nearby that can still serve for the time being.

SENATOR STURGEON: We have in this 30 percent that we presently have and I'm assuming that this was also purchased on priority or for some apparently pressing reason, and some of this stuff has been in State ownership now for 30 years and it doesn't have anything on it, not even sanitary facilities, and if we don't have the money to develop what we already have, I can't conceive how we are going to get the money to develop something for the future, and if we can't develop it, I see no purpose in having it. And you mentioned using this for grazing lands. I'm familiar with some of this property that is in public ownership where the grazing fees actually amount to less than the taxes would be if it were in private ownership, so I think we are taking huge chunks of land off of the ad valorem tax roll and getting nothing back for it. And where the revenues go into general funds they are not ear-marked for any development as I understand this budgeting system.

MR. KELLER: This is true.

SENATOR STURGEON: So while I go along with your thought that income should help with the development, under our present system it doesn't. It simply is dumped in the pot and used up for general purposes. I didn't give you a question there so there is nothing to answer.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Senator Arnold. That was a good speech, Senator, just the same.

SENATOR ARNOLD: Getting back to the subject of fees, Mr. Keller, I inferred from your answer that you don't advocate the flat fee basis on all of our recreation facilities. Rather you think it should be adjusted to what the circumstances are connected with each facility?

MR. KELLER: No, Senator, I certainly wouldn't have wanted to leave that impression. I think the fee structure should be uniform throughout for like facilities, that the use of a trailer site should be the same fee no matter where the park is or the use of a camp site or whatever. I think the fee should be uniformly applied in every park, but that the total structure should be raised to something approaching greater equity in the value received by the people using these parks.

SENATOR ARNOLD: That answers my question. Then it would vary according to what the facility offered?

MR. KELLER: On the nature of the facility. Obviously, if you had a development where there was nothing in it except a rest room and it was basically for scenic purposes, you

might conceivably charge a very low fee such as we do at the one up on the Monterey Coast where you pay 25 cents just for going in and driving around and there are some tables where you can have a cold picnic, but this is the limit of it. It is mainly a scenic area. Other places there might be a fairly elaborate facility where you could park a trailer and hook up all the utilities and the rest of it and your fee would be higher for that and so on. But it would be uniform for the same kind of services offered. It should be uniform.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Senator Quick has a question.

SENATOR QUICK: Mr. Keller, what do you think about the State taking over a lot more land than what they already have? What do you think about whether or not it would discourage private industry from going in and developing these areas? In other words, the State has it and people can't get to it. It would be there for 20 years, 30 years, 10 years, whatever it might be and no development on it.

MR. KELLER: Senator, if we think in terms of the kind of criteria which apply to a State Park System, I don't think we can visualize that a private industry would ever develop along those lines. If we are thinking that a State Park System should rely or have as one of its major criteria great scenic beauty and the preservation of that scenic beauty or historic significance and the preservation of it, it would seem to me that this is the sort of thing that private industry as a rule doesn't get into except in some rare instances such as Greenfield

Village in Detroit or Williamsburg, and even that wasn't private in the strict sense of the word. If we are thinking in terms of just straight recreation like building an artificial lake, it is true that private industry does this to some extent, but I don't think this is the area of competition between public and private. In fact, it shouldn't be the area of competition.

SENATOR QUICK: But the point is, if this project were adapted on the basis that you recommend, the State would have this land and it would be idle land for many many years, is that not true?

MR. KELLER: It could be in many instances, yes, sir.

SENATOR QUICK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions by the Committee? Mrs. Davis.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS: One very quick one if I may, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Keller, going back to this comment on this recommendation for increasing the fees to the user, may I ask you in view of the fact that we are discussing here a general obligation bond which we plan to propose to the general public of the State, and they would assume this cost and if they were to vote affirmatively for this general obligation bond for this type of development and then you are also saying that in addition to that then the ones that are interested in using the facilities should pay once more at a higher fee and since they would be paying twice then really, can you explain to me

your justification in your recommendation?

MR. KELLER: Yes, Mrs. Davis, I think I can. A general obligation bond issue obligates everybody in the State including those who, if I may say so, wouldn't be caught dead in a State Park. They just don't believe in that as a form of recreation. Everybody has his own ideas of what recreation is. Nevertheless, we would all share in the cost of buying those lands, including those who then use it. The difference then is that those who do use it should pay something more. I can't frankly see why all of us should pay the full bill for the benefit of just those that use a given facility particularly in the recreational sense. I would frankly take some issue with Mr. DeTurk in his estimation that 50 percent of the people of the State of California make use of the State Parks. That is 50 percent of the individuals. It is true that the figures he quote are obviously larger than our total population because they are on visitor days and it might be that the same people would go to a variety of State Parks in the course of a year, a dozen or more times. But I think that from my observations that this is substantially less than 30 percent of the total population of the State.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Mr. Gaffney.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Mr. Keller, some years ago the Division of Highways was in the same relative financial position as the Park and Recreation Commission has been over the years. They finally through legislative enactment set aside

a revolving fund that when a piece of land was desirable for highway purposes they could move in before inflation took place and took it right from under their feet. Instead of a crash program, don't you think we should possibly look forward to this bond issue as merely being the first step in a continuing revolving fund arrangement for the Park and Recreation Commission so that when available sites and desirable sites are to be gotten, they have the money to negotiate as against just taking the 75 million dollars and acquiring everything and waking up the sleeping dogs of the real estate fraternity, with all due apologies to them as individuals, merely speaking of the economic trend? Don't you think we should look forward to a financial arrangement by the Park and Recreation Commission so that we would have some money to buy and to negotiate, not to be coming to the Legislature like a gentleman with a hat in his hand every time they want a few dollars to do something that is needed to be done?

MR. KELLER: Mr. Gaffney, I think I would agree that this should be part of the program, that there inevitably will be some desirable areas that have no basic scenic values that are subject to destruction and possibly one of the best examples might be some of the privately owned benchlands of today, that instead of attempting to go in and force in every case sale or condemnation now that from time to time some of these things come on the market and if they are part of the plan, then it would be desirable to have the funds available to snap these up

as they come onto the market for one reason or another, the settlement of an estate or any one of a dozen reasons why this might occur as against forcing an issue and having to go to condemnation and possibly paying more by this method. But as to the analogy of the highway system, it doesn't make very much difference to a highway system what was there to begin with. If you don't buy it today and somebody builds on it in the meantime, you can tear it all down and still make a good highway out of it, but in the case of scenic areas, once they are destroyed scenically, you just don't recreate them. It would be prohibitive financially if not impossible in a physical sense to recreate them. Once you have cut off the hilltops and put a subdivision on them, you can't build the hilltops and the forest back again and this is the kind of area that we think should be in the top priority to use these funds to get them now before they can be destroyed.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Thank you. The concluding question, don't you think we also should look forward to encouraging local communities to meet their own recreational needs as far as possible? There is such a slight difference in the definition as to what is State-wide interest and what is local interest in recreation. But I was very happy to learn at our last meeting that Los Angeles had floated a very considerable bond issue, a crash program bond issue because of the impact of recreational needs in this county. Now other counties, aside from those that are absolutely financially helpless, if other counties

could be encouraged to meet the State in this expanding program of recreational facilities, then you would meet the awful impact of this increasing population. Otherwise, 75 million dollars--I'm not frowning on it, but it doesn't mean much when you get the figures from Mr. DeTurk that right now we are 30 percent lacking in meeting the needs even at the present time.

MR. KELLER: We would certainly agree that local entities, be they county or city or regional districts, should be encouraged as much as possible to proceed with their share of the problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions of this witness? Thank you very much, Mr. Keller.

MR. KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: I'm going to ask is Dr. Harold Crowe, M.D., in the room? Dr. Crowe, I want to ask you a question before you take the witness stand. Are you representing the Sierra Club?

DR. CROWE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Who is Mr. David Brower? Is he representing the Sierra Club also?

DR. CROWE: He is the Executive Secretary of the Sierra Club and had planned to be here and is not able to be and asked me to substitute.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: I see.

DR. CROWE: And I had only available a morning hour.

Now, this will be about 5 minutes.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Yes, I understand that and we are happy to have you here and I wanted to be sure Mr. Brower would not be here so we might cross him off. All right. He will not be here. He was scheduled for this afternoon. You give your name then and your official position here today for the record and be seated if you will and proceed with your statement.

DR. CROWE: My name is Harold Crowe, of the Orthopedic Hospital and I had planned to appear here on behalf of my children and I have in the 35 years of working in a charity clinic for crippled children which is a job which carries no remuneration, acquired a family of about 6,000 kids and I want for these children the same privileges I have had as a young man which I can no longer use at this age, but I want them to have it. Well now, having been asked to appear on behalf of the Sierra Club my constituency now has gone up to about 20,000 people who are of voting age and I leave my office on behalf of the children, and I now have a backing and we appear only to ask that the bond issue be approved by this Commission and to express our desire that land acquisition be your major effort and we make it on the same basis as Mr. Keller, that land becomes less and less available and we look at the idea of idle land as something which in the future, if the next generation doesn't want it, they can sell it, and they can certainly sell it at a profit

the way land is progressing now in California. So I don't think this idle land is going to be a loss and the only other point I would make is the fact that I know if you have any opposition, which I haven't heard yet, you will find gentlemen asking you not to legislate on the basis of emotion. Well, Gentlemen, if you can't do that, I pray God help us and I look at the men who sat around the campfire at Yellowstone back in the middle of the last century and they had in their hands a fortune. If they had charged 25 cents a person admission, their grandchildren would now be multi-millionaires, but these were sentimental men for purely emotional reasons, and they felt, "This is too beautiful to belong to us. This should belong to the people," and I believe on that basis I can call an analogy of another hearing in Washington where there sat on one side of the aisle this little unimportant doctor talking about wildfire and granite cliffs and clouds and their spiritual value, and on the other side was the tailored brilliant attorney of a great lumber company and he was talking about board feet and kilowatt hours and dollars. Now, this situation looked to me so ridiculous I wondered what I went to Washington for because it was just a lost cause to begin with, but astoundingly enough we won and I hope again that you gentlemen will see that for the future children land acquisition now is of great importance. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness? Doctor, I wonder if you would answer one question for Senator Sturgeon, please?

SENATOR STURGEON: I just wanted to make sure I understood you correctly. You favor the position that 100 percent of this bond issue should go for acquisition and not any for development?

DR. CROWE: Well, we obviously understand that development is necessary and we do not oppose development. However, because of the problem of population growth and land price increase which is so rapid you can't keep up with it, we think the immediate urgent thing is land acquisition.

SENATOR STURGEON: Specifically though, you think 100 percent of the bond issue should go for acquisition?

DR. CROWE: No, I would suggest if this is 100 million dollars that at least 90 million dollars go into acquisition, but that you do plan on some immediate development for the shortage of facilities which has been mentioned by Mr. DeTurk.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Senator Cameron has a question.

SENATOR CAMERON: I think maybe you answered it, but in the original bond issue proposal of 75 million dollars, and this was all done in a hurry, but now at 100 million dollars, I wonder if it meets your approval that we say a guaranteed 75 percent or 80 percent goes for acquisition and the other may go for development if the Legislature gets caught in a tight budget, but with the understanding that we will try to use for acquisition and support development out of current revenue, but if we get tight, you do know we need development and need it drastically right now, don't you?

DR. CROWE: Yes, we readily admit the need for immediate development and our position is that we will be very grateful to you, sir, for any funds you can get for acquisition and the more the better as far as we are concerned.

SENATOR CAMERON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? Thank you very much, Doctor. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony.

DR. CROWE: I thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Mr. F. M. McLaughlin. Be seated, Mr. McLaughlin, and give your name and who you represent to the Reporter and bring your staff with you. We are happy to have them also.

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: For the record, my name is F. M. McLaughlin. I represent the board of supervisors of the County of Los Angeles. I have on my left Mr. Norman Johnson, the Director of Parks and Recreation for the County of Los Angeles, and on my right, Mr. George Hjelte, the Director of Recreation and Parks of the City of Los Angeles. Let the record show that the City and County once in a while get together, particularly when they are trying to get some money from the State.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: And particularly when they are fighting legislation on either side in Sacramento. Go ahead.

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: I am also appearing at the request of the City Manager of the City of Santa Monica for that city. I think, Senators, it has been definitely established by all of

the previous testimony that a great need exists. I think there are only two ways to satisfy this need, either by additional appropriations or a bond issue. Now, I think common sense indicates that the hope of getting larger appropriations is very dim indeed. Those of us who have the job of attempting to wrestle something out of that budget from you people, you people who have the problem of attempting to get elected without increasing taxes, I think the only alternative left to us is a bond issue. Actually I think the State has been niggardly in its appropriations for parks and recreation. When you stop and consider that the County of Los Angeles, its budget alone for parks and recreation is approximately 12 million dollars annually and if you will add to that the budget of the City of Los Angeles and the other cities within the county, you would find that in this one area a great deal more is being spent in development of beaches and parks than is being spent by the State of California. But this I think is water under the bridge. The problem is here and it has to be solved.

It would be my own personal opinion that the bond issue figure is not large enough. We have I think--what is it, Mr. Johnson, the projects we are recommending be included in the bond issue--to the tune of some 32 million dollars. All of these are large-scale recreation projects, parks in excess of 200 acres or beach frontage which you have already heard attested this morning in this county is reaching proportions of approximately \$1500 a front foot.

With the growth of the smog problem, we always bring this one along, the value of lands on the western sides of the county and particularly in the beach areas extending from Ventura County line to the Orange County line, and I think this is true on down the coast, this property is increasing in excess of 10 percent a year, and anyone who has to buy beach frontage knows this. If this frontage is not obtained and obtained very shortly, then I don't think it can be because I think the price will get out of hand even for public agencies. There is a point beyond which we don't go. We reach a taxation problem that means the elimination of those who are imposing the taxes. So I think that you have to look at this problem and I think you have to think big, exactly as you did in meeting the water problem, the largest public bond issue ever presented to the people, and maybe it isn't big enough, but parks and development of beaches and parks and recreational facilities in this State in my opinion is equally important as the development of our highways or our water. This is something that people must have and unless we do something about it we are going to wind up in the position of people in the metropolitan states of the east where the only time they see grass is when they go to a ball game or a movie. If you don't preserve and if you don't obtain these sites now there is going to be nothing left for you to obtain for the people. I think that you have to have some money in here for development because the need is great today as Mr. Hjelt or Mr. Johnson or anyone in the recreational field can testify.

Our beaches on a busy summer day--sand space is at a premium. Our parks are overloaded and overcrowded. I think, Senator, there has to be money for local subvention. We have in this county, with the City of Los Angeles, the City of Santa Monica and the county, done quite a job with the State in a partnership agreement. The State has acquired the beach lands. The county and the various cities have developed, operated and maintained these at a considerable cost, but the State is faced with no cost of lifeguards, attendants, clean-up, building of facilities, rest rooms and the various other things that are appurtenant to it. We are doing the same thing in partnership agreement with the State at Puddingstone Dam. The State has acquired 1800 acres and we are developing it. In many of these cases the development cost and the maintenance and operation costs are greater than the acquisition cost was originally. We are glad to do this because it has made available thousands of acres of recreational facilities that would not have been had not the partnership concept been entered into or it would have been acreage that would have been just sitting there with nothing happen ing. You can't have beaches without lifeguards and all the rest of the facilities that are needed. They are unusable to people. Now, I think this would be the general statement we would like to make.

First, we think the bond issue should be bigger. I don't see anything to get terrified about. I think it should be 150 million rather than 100 million. Mr. Keller has testified on a

40-year issue that you are talking about 3 and a half million dollars a year to service it and handle the bond issue. We are forecasting our population in four years will be 20 million or in excess of that. We know that this county is growing at the rate of 200 thousand people a year permanent new residents coming in. I think the population will be big enough. But if you think small in the thing we are going to be in the same position that we have been in the past where we have all over this area half-finished projects. We buy X number of front footage of beach and we haven't the money to buy the rest of it. We finally get it. It is at an astronomical price. So we should be able to complete these projects. We should be able to get them moving..

I think if you do go to subvention that you probably are going to have to use some sort of formula per capita because the people who are going to pay the larger share of the bill are the people who will use the local facilities the most, and I think they have a right to an equitable share of this.

We are fully aware that you have certain counties in the State whom the Almighty has blessed with tremendous recreational facilities and yet they are of a nature that their tax base is such that they couldn't possibly cooperate. But also their population is not where they need these large day-use facilities. We are aware, too, before somebody in the Committee brings it up that if you take a census in any of the State Parks in the Great North and Tahoe up in Senator Arnold's county on any given

day, you will find a large percentage of the people are from Southern California.

We are equally aware that for every one person you will find in that camp on a given day in the summer you find 100 on a State-owned beach in Southern California. These are arguments we have been through in the past. So when the formula thing comes up, Senator, we'll argue that thing out. We are meeting tomorrow in San Francisco with the Parks Committee of the County Supervisors Association at which point I think will come sort of a better policy statement on this matter of local subventions which we will give to your Committee I understand at your meeting in San Francisco on Wednesday. This is the general statement. I would like both Mr. Hjelte and Mr. Johnson to particularize a little more for you on various projects, more particularly on one of the historical monuments in Los Angeles County, the restoration of the Plaza area which again the city and the county have contributed their money to and are asking the State to finish the project up. It is another one of these projects that we get a token appropriation of 100 thousand dollars or 200 thousand dollars. It is half-finished. It is neither fish nor fowl. If we could complete the things we could be producing some revenue that might go into further development, but as it is now, again it is just half-finished. We need about 2 and a half million dollars to finish it.

The City of Santa Monica needs approximately 5 million dollars to complete the acquisition of the major properties along

the ocean front which would in turn make all of that beach area of the Santa Monica area about 4 and a half miles available completely for public use. I will now yield to Mr. Johnson first for the county and then Mr. Hjelte for the city.

MR. JOHNSON: I would like to concur in the remarks of Mr. McLaughlin and to further substantiate them by attempting to identify what I believe is still the tremendous opportunity that you as our legislative representatives have and that some other states let's say are not as fortunate. California is truly blessed even with the critical situation we are identifying today in that the native resources are tremendous and if they are protected at this time, there is every assurance that the future populations of California are going to have the experiences that we are now talking about.

More specifically, you are probably acquainted with the efforts of the 12 Southern California counties wherein they formed an inter-county planning group actually to assist the State of California in the development of its California public outdoor recreation plan.

In that inventory I think it is very very significant that we recognize that there were 1600 individual recreation resources in Southern California. This is the opportunity that I think we should recognize and extend all our efforts to seeing that these areas are preserved in one form or another. I think because of your interest you have stimulated the California Supervisors' Association to the point that for the first time

they are really aware of the recreation responsibilities. We know the position of the league, the various school districts, the various recreation districts, that all these component parts make up the total and recreation is a word that has gained significance that never existed before, but this again is the opportunity that we have to move in this direction.

I feel extremely fortunate representing the County of Los Angeles, particularly since 1955 we have had a board of supervisors that has supported the Department all along the line. Many of the things that you have heard I think are highly complimentary but in all fairness to those individual members of the board, they have given unqualified support to the Department, but it is all too slow. This is our whole purpose and concern in these hearings. It is too slow, but we have used every gimmick in the book from actual purchases to lease options to contract arrangements to try and hold lands that may pass from resource potential if there is not action. I would like to point out here that here is an item that is on the agenda of the board of supervisors only tomorrow dealing with four extremely critical areas in Los Angeles County right now, and in dollars and cents the cost of the first priority is \$6,000 an acre, and the second is \$7,500 dollars an acre. The third is \$12,000 an acre and the fourth priority is \$20,000 an acre. Now, this recommendation is asking our board to take such action as to insure that these lands will be held for development at the opportune time.

In the original draft of this report of the board of supervisors, we identified an area as number 1 priority and I think

Mr. Hjelte will surely concur in this, that a major regional park should be acquired in the Baldwin Hills area, the most critical, highest priority area in all of Los Angeles County and objectively there was no disagreement on this priority. In talking to the owners and attempting to offer better advice and consultation to the board of supervisors, the minimum cost is \$80,000 an acre. Obviously, we rationalize once in a while and for this reason this 80-thousand-dollar project was dropped. The opportunity is gone. As critical as the situation is in this Los Angeles metropolitan area, we still cannot deal with acreage even in top priorities at \$80,000 an acre. And yet this is the concern of the county and many of the cities have to find the opportunities, the vehicles that will allow us to acquire these properties. Mr. DeTurk spoke of 148-million-dollar program for the County of Los Angeles.

Very very briefly, Gentlemen, this program which is merely identification of our funds--it is not a special levy, it is not a district, but merely identification in the City of Los Angeles that an appropriation is for park purposes and is protected so that it remains for park purposes, and this 148-million-dollar obligation is the projection of what it will cost us to maintain and develop the existingly-owned parks in Los Angeles County for the next 10 years. In that entire 148 million dollars there are only 3 million dollars for acquisition so astronomical as this figure sounds, it still does not deal with the needs

because currently, existing right today, there is a deficiency of 12,000 regional acres in the County of Los Angeles, and this 148 million dollars does nothing to relieve that condition. So you can see our concern and desire to support you, and as Mac put it, think big. The opportunity is yours and ours. Thank you.

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: Mr. Hjelte, for the City of Los Angeles.

MR. HJELTE: Mr. Chairman and Honorable Members of the Committee, I am very happy to join with my colleagues from the county in presenting some points of view concerning this matter because the city after all is a part of the county, and we are dependent upon the county in many ways and they are dependent upon the city as well which has half the population of the county and a good portion of the total area of the county as a matter of fact, and so all the cities must share with the county in the responsibility for providing land and facilities and leadership and program for recreation. Those who seek recreation in parks know no jurisdictional boundaries, and we must therefore work together as we have so well heretofore. I speak in behalf of the City of Los Angeles and especially of its Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners who give their unqualified support to the proposal that there be a substantial bond issue on the ballot upon which the people may give their expression for park and recreation purposes. Our view is that we should think large in regard to the amount of this bond issue and we speak from

experience had heretofore in respect to that point of view. In Los Angeles we have had three bond issues for park and recreation areas and their improvement. There was one in 1923 for a million and a half dollars; another in 1947 for 12 million 500 thousand dollars; and another in 1957 for 39 and a half million dollars. The State had a bond issue back I believe in 1928 which was in the amount as I recall of 10 million dollars which really created the State Park System and San Francisco has had a bond issue recently, in recent years of 12 million dollars. I have had a part in the promotion of interest in these programs as well as in the spending of the money and I am convinced and was convinced that each time the prevailing opinion was that we didn't ask for enough money when we went before the voters for these bond issues. We proposed, for example, on the last occasion in Los Angeles that the city vote 70 million dollars, but taking counsel of those who were very conservative it was carved down to 39 and a half million dollars and it's all too small to take care of our tremendous needs. We feel that the spending of the money should be governed by some such provisions as were contained in the legislation that appropriated 10 million dollars of State money for the purchase of beaches and 5 million dollars some seven or eight years ago for the purchases of State Park land which provided that this money could not be spent unless there were master plans that had been properly processed and approved by the local jurisdictional bodies and also by the State Park Commission. The point raised by Assemblyman Gaffney

I think is a very good one, namely that there should be a land bank, that funds should be available to take care of the opportunities particularly on occasions when you can buy lands under special circumstances that make it available at a less price than later, but this would^{be} ineffective unless there were a provision as to master plan control of the spending of the money.

I believe the State Highway Commission can pursue the policy that was set forth because they know where the highways are going to go quite definitely and if we don't know where the parks are going to be located, then of course the spending of the money might be subject to expediency and to pressures, but if we proceed according to master plans that have proper approval, I think it is a very good proposal, Assemblyman, that you have made here and our experience would lend it a great deal of support.

We would like to make a plea that there be included in the programs funds to aid cities in the doing of the job which naturally falls upon them to do. After all, 80 percent of the people of the State are going to live in cities and these cities are so encumbered with new responsibilities that are a drain upon their resources that they find it almost impossible to take care of needs that contribute to the amenities of living in a city as distinguished from the things such as storm drains, for example, and sewers and bridges and streets which are absolutely necessary at the moment. The other things are always put off because these

things make the prior demands and consequently the cities do need some help. I had occasion a couple of years ago to make an analysis of the amount of lands that these cities have in California for park and recreation purposes and I was indeed quite surprised to see how delinquent we have been according to national standards accepted. There is a national standard that has been accepted for a long time, it should be more generous now in view of the expanding leisure and also of the automobile influencing these matters, but the standard of one acre per 100 people has been on the books for a good long time. In 1955, which was the last year concerning which statistics were available as to what cities had, I found these facts, that San Diego had 141 people per acre instead of 100 people per acre according to the standards. San Francisco had at that time 211 people per acre of park; Los Angeles, 220; Long Beach, 256; and Oakland, 680, so you see how efficient we were then.

Since that time there has been some improvement in the gross amount of land available for park and recreational purposes because of what San Francisco has done, Los Angeles and Long Beach and other cities, but so has our population increased, so relatively our position is probably not better now than it was in 1955. Statistics will be available as to 1960 before the end of this very month as a matter of fact, and we can confirm what I have said about the relative position of cities.

How ridiculous it is that we have so little land in these great cities for the local recreation purposes. We have taken

away the streets from the people. Streets used to be a pretty good place for assembly as well as for sports and so on. We have given it to the automobile and we have taken away also the private lands, not only the big estates which once were available for the recreation of the people who were not so numerous then, but also the privately owned unoccupied lands in the cities have all been built up now so we have a tremendous problem of trying to get some lands right where the people live.

Our planning heretofore with respect to this I can highlight by mentioning one thing and that is baseball, which is our great national pastime.. How in the world are you going to get your kids to exercise vigorously and the young adults if we don't have space for them to play? Do you know we have in Long Beach only one standardized diamond, or we had in 1955?

Imagine, the five largest cities in California at that time had one for 18,700 people. San Diego had only one such for 60,000 people; Oakland one for 39,000; Los Angeles, one for 42,000 and so on, and in a place like San Pedro, which is a city populated by 60,000 people, we have only one area mind you level enough and big enough and in public ownership so you can have baseball as it ought to be played in that town. Glendale has only one such diamond and that is a city of nearly 100,000 people. We have a tremendous problem here of getting money to buy lands even though we have to take out sub-standard blighted homes in order to create properties for this purpose as we are doing over here in the oldest part of the city, Boyle Heights, where we are

getting six acres and we are spending \$850,000 for it, chopping off houses and lots, eight of them; in fact, consolidating enough lands to provide space for parks. Well, so much for that. We feel also that there should be money in the program for improvements. It doesn't avail the State much if it buys a piece of land and lets it lie idle for a good long time and it runs counter to an economic principle here that if you don't put the land to an economic use, you have an economic loss and so denying improvement of beach lands that have been acquired and of State Parks that have been acquired heretofore and will be acquired probably under this new program, it doesn't make sense to keep them out of development. It is absolutely essential that there be funds set aside and made available as was said by the Senator here for improvement when such was necessary and could not be financed out of current funds.

Now, if I may have your indulgence, I would like to speak about a project which the State, the city and the county is already committed to. We have in Los Angeles the Los Angeles Pueblo de Los Angeles, which is the birthplace of the City of Los Angeles and it is sometimes spoken of as Alvaro Street. Alvaro Street is only one small part of the whole, but it is that part that is now economically operated to the extent that we have an estimated profit each year from those operations of \$78,000 and it costs about \$80,000 to provide for the operation. Now, heretofore there has been put into this State Park through cooperative effort of the city, county and State, the total of

3 million 300 thousand dollars. I might say that this is the Williamsburg of Southern California which was made possible, of course, by Rockefeller money, but which is operated out of revenues now had from its hotels and commodity sales and so on. This is the kind of project that Pueblo de Los Angeles is.

The kernel of it is the block in which the Pico House is located. Where also there is the first masonic building in California and a theater and several other buildings. To bring this property upon which the State has already appropriated about 2 and a half million dollars up to operational use will cost another 2 and a half million dollars, and to clear the land, part of which is already purchased, and to raze the buildings and to begin the development of the adjacent land in this State Park should be taken care of to the extent of another 2 and a half million dollars. So we would like to make strong representation in behalf of including in the program sufficient funds to take care of Pueblo de Los Angeles in the manner in which I have indicated. Thank you very much, Gentlemen and Mrs. Davis for your attention.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions by the members? Senator Arnold has a question.

SENATOR ARNOLD: Mr. McLaughlin, I think you mentioned a figure of 31 million dollars for proposed projects in Los Angeles County.

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: These are the county recommendations only, Senator. They would not include the 5 million

mentioned here by Mr. DeTurk. I notice he has recommended 8 million dollars of acquisition for additional beaches in Los Angeles City. The City of Santa Monica estimates approximately 5 million dollars will be necessary to complete their project. The total, Senator, would probably run well over 50 million dollars.

SENATOR ARNOLD: Is that acquisition only?

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: Mostly acquisition, Senator, the Pueblo development.

SENATOR CAMERON: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the Santa Monica and Los Angeles developments, are most of those now done under the partnership concept?

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: Under a lease contract with the State which the Cities of Los Angeles and Santa Monica both have with the State.

SENATOR CAMERON: And this could carry on whether or not there was this separate subvention program?

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: I believe so, Senator. I don't think anybody would be hurt about getting some additional money for the development, but for instance the City of Santa Monica hired a firm to develop the lands which the State bought. It is a very fine development. Had the Committee time or if they do have time in the future we would be delighted to arrange for a tour of some of these to see the type of thing that has been done. I think one of the things that was learned was that you can't have a large publicly-owned beach, which was the case in

Santa Monica bay area, and no parking for them because you limit the usage completely in a metropolitan area. Since the parking has been put in, the attendance has more than quadrupled because I don't think you can build any facilities today in the State of California recreational-wise or any other way that you don't provide adequate parking.. This is just axiomatic in our present life.

SENATOR CAMERON: Just taking some figures, I would gather that your recommendation would be that the bond issued should be in the neighborhood of 175 million dollars or 200 million dollars?

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: Senator, it's got to be big or you are going to be stuck exactly as you are now. You recall-- I don't believe you were in the Senate--I think Senator Arnold and Senator Williams were when the tideland money was released. Mrs. Davis was a member of the Legislature when the tideland money was released in Louisiana after the suit. Of course, we played pork barrel. We got in one of those games where everybody had to get something so we could get 54 votes and as a consequence we have a lot of half-finished projects. Now, I wouldn't want to see this program developed into that type of thing either. I think whatever we do has to be a well-thought-out program so that the people actually get full benefit for the dollar invested and I think you have to go on, as previous speakers said, you have to go on a crash program on acquisition. We had cases under that previous program--I think we had a couple

of legislative hearings on it, where acquisition was taking two and three and four years. In counties such as ours that are large enough and had staff enough, we made an offer to the State that we would take over the mechanics of the acquisition program within our county for them, but you can't start negotiating for a piece of property and go for two or three years on it. You know what is going to happen. I think that the program has got to be big. It has to be well thought out. There has to be a certain degree of objectivity.

SENATOR CAMERON: On that point, I think you know me well enough to know that to me California is one state.

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: I was born in San Francisco and raised in Los Angeles and so was Mr. Hjelte, and Senator Cameron is a native of Los Angeles who got tired of smog and went up to the area where the air was clear.

SENATOR CAMERON: You wouldn't mind, would you, if we called the Pueblo de Los Angeles the Williamsburg of all of California?

MR. HJELTE: I certainly would not. In fact, you can call it the Williamsburg of all of the west.

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: Mr. Gaffney will recall a Los Angeles delegation in the Legislature that felt the purchase of San Francisco ferry building was a matter of historic import and we didn't feel that we were purchasing it for the City of San Francisco. We felt this was a historic monument which should be preserved for the entire State.

SENATOR CAMERON: Here is what I hope you would give some thought to before this is finally put in draft form. We have had some suggestions from a number of people as to how to administer the funds. We are talking in principle, and one was that they should be handled by regular legislative process with line items in the budget. I think before they are submitted there should be a provision for review of course by the Park Commission and the staff and submitted but I'm a little concerned with either way. If we leave the straight line item in the budget we might be tempted to use the pork barrel where it is not justified. Now, the pork barrel where somebody just gets something ahead of schedule is all right, but when they do it just because they want to get something, this is all wrong. Would you suggest any system whereby there would be a veto?

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: I don't think it is ever too smart for the Legislature to lose complete control. I think we have seen that in the past. However, I think you will agree with me we would probably have one of the most mixed up highway systems in the history of the nation if we did not have the independent budgetary independence of the State Division of Highways. However, we still within that have the right adoption program. We have certain safeguards. I think again, too, Senator, you have got to take a look. You are going to the electorate with this one. The people are going to want to know a little bit about what they are going to get before they vote. We have found in the County of Los Angeles in a period of seven or eight years when

we passed two bond issues for flood control, the first one in 1952 for 179 million dollars; the second one in 1958 for 225 million dollars, both issues carried by about an 80 percent vote, the reason being that in each issue the entire list of projects was spelled out. The people in Compton couldn't have cared less what was going to happen in Santa Monica. No one in Compton voted for 179 million dollars or 225 million dollars. They voted for the specific project in their community. So looking at it strictly from you might say the political angle of selling this bond issue, I think there is going to have to be some spelling out inside just to some degree. I share with you a fear of getting the pork barrel approach. I mean I don't think we can completely--I'm not naive enough to believe that we can completely escape it, but I think we have confidence and a great deal of it in Mr. DeTurk and his people. We would abhor some of the sins of the past, particularly in this matter of interminable delays. I think Mrs. Davis will be glad to give you the transcript of some of the testimony in the past, but I think there has to be some safeguards. I think you cannot completely let go of legislative control, and I don't say this with any lack of confidence in any department, but it has been my own personal observation that the Legislature has let go of control of maybe a little bit too much in the budget when you are sitting in Sacramento for six months arguing a budget over which in effect you only control less than 30 cents of every tax dollar raised. The rest of it by statutory constitutional amendment you have given

away. So I think we have a lot of thinking to do.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any further questions?

SENATOR CAMERON: If you will also come up with something a little more concrete in the form of principle, and as I say, I have complete confidence in the current Legislature, but I would like some safeguards in the future ones perhaps.

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: Well, Senator, as I say, perhaps tomorrow in San Francisco we can come up with some guidelines. I know what I have said at times would seem like I am contradicting myself. I have been through this thing and been very close to this park picture since 1954, particularly in the Sacramento scene. These are some of the problems that have arisen, and I think one of the finest things we did was when the Legislature put the Department of Beaches and Parks back under budgetary control and I think it is better for them. I think no matter if you vote this bond issue or not you are going to have to raise your sights on their budgets.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Yes. Don't you think we ought to make Bedell's a historic monument?

MR. MC LAUGHLIN: I think it has been made one, Mr. Gaffney.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions pertaining to this meeting? Thank you very much, Gentlemen. We appreciate having you here and having the testimony of you three gentlemen.

There is a Mr. Frank DePasquale who says he needs one minute to make a statement. Is that correct? Come up, please, and then we are going to adjourn this hearing until 1:30, P.M. I'm advised there are one or two people that would like to have gotten on this morning, but it was just not possible. Give your name and who you represent and be seated, please, and be comfortable.

MR. PASQUALE: Frank DePasquale. I'm from Elsinore, California. You have before you a picture of Elsinore Valley. It is good to know and see all you fine gentlemen who I have seen the first part of the year. You are talking about acquisition moneys for big lands. Now, we have a problem down there in Elsinore. It is good to have land for the development of these parks. About 5 and a half years ago \$350,000 was set aside to develop Lake Elsinore. To date only \$137,000 has been spent in developing Lake Elsinore. Since our Honorable Charles DeTurk took over he has helped make Elsinore, along with Mrs. Harriman from Hemet, helped make Elsinore a living project. What has become of the \$200,000 that was earmarked for Lake Elsinore? All we have spent is \$137,000, and \$200,000 hasn't been spent in 5 and a half years. We are only 71 miles from the City of Los Angeles from right downtown here. We have a big lake area which is dry now. We have parking. We have recreation there that can handle 5,000 people a day. Think of that, 5,000 people a day with boat, recreation, parking under walnut trees and so on and so forth. There is a big area there.

Now, the money that has been spent in San Simeon, the Hearst project would only be a drop in the bucket if you folks or the State would finish developing Lake Elsinore. Lake Elsinore is a very popular place and it was a popular place and brought thousands of people there. Now, the people of Lake Elsinore, Senator Cameron, the State didn't buy that land out there. The people in the valley gave their land to the State. Just think of it. We gave our lands. And what was the deal? Why did we give our lands? Because the State promised that they would develop it, they would make a lake project for the Southern California people and they would have a wonderful park area there for the people. We are not asking you folks to go out and buy any land. We gave it to you. Finish the project. Five and a half years we have been suffering out there. Gentlemen, that's all I want to tell you about is what we are suffering out there. We gave the State the land, all of it. We are not asking you to buy it. We just want you to develop, finish developing the land that you already have and I want to thank you very much for listening to me.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. DePasquale. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Any questions of this witness? Thank you very much. Now, the Committee will stand adjourned until the hour of 1:30, P.M.

(Thereupon the noon recess was taken.)

Monday, December 11, 1961, 1:30 O'clock, P.M.

---oOo---

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: The Committee will please be in order. The first witness I want to call is Dr. Pearl Chase. Will you come forward, Mrs. Chase, be seated at the table and give your name and who you represent for the record.

DR. CHASE: I am Pearl Chase from Santa Barbara and I am representing the National Conference on State Parks, the Plans and Planning Committee of Santa Barbara and the California Conservation Council. I may say that the California Conservation Council neither endorses or proposes legislation but is well aware of the importance of the problems that you are discussing and is extremely interested throughout the State in what your recommendations will be. I prepared a report with the help of Mr. Gledhill who is here because we felt that we should do two things, we should try not only to express our personal opinions about this proposed bond issue but also present the importance of considering most carefully the historical monuments. The scenic parks, the recreational parks and historical monuments are of course the three classifications for parks in California and we feel that there is not enough attention at the moment being paid to the historical monuments because of the pressure of population and the high cost of the land affects the sites of historical monuments as greatly and importantly as any other. I will merely report in a paragraph the opinion of the president of the National Conference on State Parks which

an inquiry was made and you will find on the first page as an index are the 21 items which we present. Mr. Elmer of Lansing, Michigan, says, "I believe that, as president, I can state that the National Conference on State Parks is in favor of raising special funds for site acquisition and development by means of revenue bonds, or such other bonds as may be authorized by any of the states." And at the bottom on the footnote you will notice that the Conference published two years ago a bulletin on revenue bonds and the experience of 12 states in raising such funds. The third page is supposed to be a resume of my opinions and these are representing that of the Plans and Planning Committee and I'll merely say that for 40 years I have been connected with park work at national, state and local levels and will state:

1. Steady and carefully planned and direction of the California State Park System is essential. I think that we should be very proud of those reports that have been made for the State in the last few years. I think that the people of California should have great confidence in the State administration because they have those reports to guide them. I think that I would doubt the ability of a park commission or any other staff to direct the expenditure of a great number of millions of dollars if it had not been preceded by studies such as you are familiar with.

We think that the State Park program should be supported from current funds as generously as possible so that the annual budget for planning, maintenance and improvements can be counted

upon for a five-year period.

We believe that a Constitutional amendment should provide for the issuance of State general obligation bonds not to exceed 75 million dollars. Now, that is for acquisition of sites for parks, beaches, and historical monuments of definite State-wide importance and interest and not for development costs.

We do not say that there should not be additional sums provided for in the bond issue, but there should be at least a minimum of 75 million dollars for acquisition of sites.

Bond money should not be allocated for the erection of, or purchase of "recreational facilities", as referred to in Senate Bill 602, because of the lack of careful definition and full understanding of the term.

Senator, the explanation that your bill is not a final bill and will probably be more precise in that matter would answer that objection, but certainly to appropriate bond money for recreational facilities would be unwise unless more carefully defined.

We believe that the State should provide further incentives for both regional and local developments and management of parks, beaches and historical monuments and other recreational areas. We believe that this Committee's report of the financing and the development of the California State Park System is of very great importance. I would like to call your attention to the fact that some of us are not entirely familiar with the changes in department organization and the authority of the

State Park Commission as affected by legislation and executive order and that they should be very carefully reviewed so that the most efficient and stable organization may result.

Now, the balance of our reports have to do with a situation which we take to be important to the State and that is the acquisition of the City of Santa Barbara Presidio. A survey was made in response to a bill which your friend and ours, Senator Hollister, introduced in 1957. The survey which was presented to the Commission and to the Legislature declared it desirable and feasible and Dr. DeWitt Nelson in December of 1959 put his official okay on the project as feasible, which was required by the bill passed by the Legislature.

Now, we have proceeded to complete many of the preliminary and desirable activities which were recommended in the reports and we have the hearty cooperation and interest of the whole community and as you will notice by an astonishing number of the people who represent the major property interests in the area, two millionaire corporations have purchased land and taken over possession of two properties in Santa Barbara and declared their willingness to cooperate even to the surrender of properties, and I would like to say that the post office which might as a Federal agency threaten the Presidio says it doesn't intend to go any farther. That is, it will not say, "I want that land, too."

Now, we have created in Santa Barbara all of those features which make an historical monument of interest and value. We will

protect through an ordinance suggested by Mr. Gledhill who is here an area 16 blocks in the center of town in which nothing can be changed, no building built that will not conform in architecture with this particular unit, and we feel that because of the rising cost of land and because of the need to go ahead rapidly, that we should put forward this project as an example of the need for more attention to the historical areas of Santa Barbara, California.

To tell the people here what the Royal Presidio of Santa Barbara is, I'll merely say it contains two usable occupied units of the original Presidio, that the Presidio was one of four, San Diego, Monterey, San Francisco and Santa Barbara, representing the civil and military establishment of the Spanish era, that there is no other visible piece of Presidio in the State of California. You own four missions. Twenty of the twenty-one missions have been preserved. No presidio has been preserved and this would be the oldest possible area of historic interest of that type that you could support.

Now, I'm going to ask Mr. Gledhill to take the last minute and, Mr. Gledhill--will you authorize me to read this?

MR. GLEDHILL: Yes.

DR. CHASE: Mr. Gledhill has secured from the California Historical Society the statements included in this review, that of the Conference of California Historical Societies, the Society of California Pioneers, the Historical Society of San Luis Obispo County, the Historical Society of Southern

California, the Ventura County Historical Society and the Native Sons and Daughters of the Golden West, which at their annual Grand Parlor meetings have, both of them, endorsed this project and requested attention from the Legislature. Again I say that we feel that the attention to and appropriations for acquisition of sites of the historical monuments of California is extremely important and I believe that if properly presented you would have not only the support of those of us that are interested in wilderness and scenic and recreational parks, but also those that are extremely interested in the background of California. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Any questions of Dr. Chase? Thank you. Mr. Gaffney has a question, Doctor.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: It is really an observation that you are not quite correct when you say there is no presidio preserved. The Presidio of San Francisco has been used by the officers as an officers' club for at least 60 or 70 years and it is in a fine state of preservation. Otherwise, your statement is correct.

DR. CHASE: May I say that there is a piece of adobe wall about the size of an ordinary desk incorporated in a wall of the officers' club in San Francisco. It is not a building that was there. We have the real buildings, but there is only a piece of adobe wall I think in the officers' club.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Then, you would say the San Francisco Presidio should be restored? If you will buy that, I'll

buy Santa Barbara.

DR. CHASE: May I say it was the opinion of the historians and others making the report that it was very wise and proper to restore one and they felt that the one in Santa Barbara was the most possible and desirable. The one in San Diego, there is a site on the top of that beautiful hill where the Serra Museum is, you know, but there are no remains.

San Diego old town would be extremely valuable as a historical monument. In Monterey I believe it is true that in the entire property it is covered by Catholic institutions that are in present use and would not be destroyed. I believe that is true, is it not, Senator Farr?

SENATOR FARR: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: May I say in conclusion, that if there is any particularly beautiful thing among all the beauties of Santa Barbara, it is your court house. It is one of the architectural gems of the whole world, the court house in Santa Barbara, but could I say, Mr. Williams, that when the Committee does adjourn, may we do so in respect to the memory of our beloved Senator John Hollister?

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: We did that in Sacramento at the last meeting, but there is no reason why it can't be done again and it will be.

One other question. Mr. Gledhill, does he wish to testify or were you testifying for him?

MR. GLEDHILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to show

the Committee what the presidio looked like.

SENATOR FARR: I would like to comment to the other members of the Committee that we should all be very thankful to Mrs. Chase because she has been the inspiration for the preservation of many of the things that happen in Santa Barbara and I think it was some years ago in Readers' Digest she was referred to as the Pearl of the Pacific. She is an outstanding person in conservation.

DR. CHASE: May I say this, that I did not, of course, forward any mention of Senator Hollister, but four days before he was taken sick I had made an appointment with him at his request to discuss the status of this project because there is a great deal of money being invested now by the city and the county and the historical society in enhancing this particular area. The county is loaning a park area for the building of a new building by the historical society and as I say, these millionaires are investing with every intention of protecting the area and sharing parking and other spaces, but as I say, I feel that we should remember the other historical areas as well as that at Santa Barbara.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, Doctor.
Thank you very much, Mr. Gledhill.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Could we find out what historical value we might have in those islands off Santa Barbara? We have never been able to get over there and see what they look like.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Mr. William Penn Mott, Jr., please. Is he here, Mr. Mott, Jr.?

DR. CHASE: He was here this morning.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: He may drop in later. Mrs. Beula Edmiston. Would you come forward, be seated and give your name and who you represent for the record and proceed to make your statement, please?

MRS. EDMISTON: I am Beula Edmiston. Before I represent the Southern California Chapter of Nature Conservancy, I wish to become a statistic. My family and I have been turned away from State Beaches and Parks much more often than we are able to be entered. We do believe in signs. We move quietly on and have not become a statistic, but we, too, would like to have more facilities.

Now, I become the secretary of the Southern California Chapter of the Nature Conservancy. We agree with the many people who have said that the time to acquire property for public use is now while we still have the opportunity. We strongly endorse acquisition now while the land is available and we put our emphasis on acquisition. We agree there are certain necessary developments. I wouldn't presume and my organization wouldn't presume to call the particulars but I know the people of California would be comfortable in knowing that we have the land. From the land development is possible. The Nature Conservancy is concerned with the local, the regional, the green belt development.

We highly realize its value and importance, but with the

continued pressure of population in our State we need the area to stretch our legs, stretch our lungs and also to stretch our imagination, and the great esthetics that come from natural areas. There is something rather fine in that. I'm so glad our ancestors didn't develop everything and left some natural area for me and for my family and for others to come. I hope we save some of it in its natural state.

As a taxpayer, and I know with your body with all of the problems of "We want so much for development", it is comforting to know that a sizable lot of people want something left natural. God did enough for it, let's just keep it that way. And there are many areas of distinctive character. We urge that you set aside as many of them as you can now. They are slipping through our fingers. By the time this group of scientists or organizations largely made up of scientists and educators come in with a report, someone has plowed it up. There was a magnificent plot of desert lilies down below Desert Center on a good year which were higher than my head. I couldn't walk into them to have a picture taken because then I would trample them and I don't trample flowers. The next time we went by it was leveled, and I don't know what was going in, but something. So the time to act is now on natural areas because they won't be natural long and once gone they are gone.

There are many kinds. There is our coastal sand dune, this coastal salt marsh so important to the water birds. Perhaps there are a few fresh water marshes. There are so many kinds of

natural things that are important to our State of State significance. I hope that they can be set aside. I'm authorized to offer our assistance free. We can give technical assistance on some of these places and their relative values. We make current studies all the time. That service would be at your service upon request.

Last November at our board of trustees meeting four teachers of natural sciences testified there is no natural spot available-- excuse me, not no, there are too few natural spots available to take their classes on field trips or even to recommend for personal exploration. They are criticized. "Don't send your students onto my property. Don't send your students into this development." Where can they go for their geology? Where can they go for their natural science? It is a very real problem to the educators of our State, and we respectfully request the things of significance be set aside for the people of California in those very real and less organized types of recreation and spiritual refreshment.

There are areas of great scientific value. The only real measuring stick we have for progress is measured against the natural. If time permits, I would like to read a paragraph on Nature Conservancy's understanding of the importance of natural areas. If time does not permit, I'll simply add it to the record in writing. Do you have the time?

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: How long will your presentation take?

MRS. EDMISTON: Perhaps one and a half minutes.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Go right ahead.

MRS. EDMISTON: "Natural areas constitute an irreplaceable resource, as important to mankind as the earth's economic products. They are the living museums that exemplify the past for the benefit of the future. Once they have been destroyed, they are gone forever.

"The more civilization crowds forward, the fewer natural areas there will be, and the more precious they will become. If there are to be any natural areas left for the future, they must be set aside today.

"Natural areas are requisite to our way of life for it is to nature that man frequently turns for inspiration. Also, they furnish the only true background against which to measure the changes that civilization has wrought in our environment. They often help us to understand and tolerate such changes. As living museums of an earlier day, they provide unsurpassed opportunities for studies in the natural sciences."

There are many historic and prehistoric natural areas. I agree with Mrs. Chase they certainly should be saved for their historic significance. We commend you and we hope that this issue receives your full support and the full support of the people of California. We are with you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Are there any questions of this witness? Senator Sturgeon has a question.

SENATOR STURGEON: You are placing your emphasis on

acquisition. There has been a very careful study made by the Department, more of an inventory, and a five-year plan laid out and there are some figures here I would like to give you and see if you could support them both for acquisition and for development. Now, the one for acquisition is somewhere around 91 million dollars and for development around 71 million dollars. Do you feel that your group could support both figures in a single bond issue?

MRS. EDMISTON: I could not speak for the board of trustees or our membership because we haven't had that thing to say. As an individual, let me answer. I know certain development is imperative. I want a campsite, too, but even I can wait for a campsite for tomorrow, but I can't wait for a natural area preservation or the preservation for a future campsite even because tomorrow a multi-millionaire, a multi-million-dollar development might be on it. We are not prepared to handle your budgetary figures. We realize it is a science in itself. We just say our great stress and emphasis is acquisition.

SENATOR STURGEON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Thank you very much.

MRS. EDMISTON: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Is William Penn Mott, Jr., here? The next witness then will be Mr. Lachlan Richards, Chief of the Division of Small Craft Harbors. Give your name and representation

MR. RICHARDS: My name is Lachlan Richards, Chief of the State Division of Small Craft Harbors. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my remarks will be geared primarily today to bring to your consideration the need for and benefits to be expected through Senate Bill 602 and SCR 15, particularly relative to the responsibilities, authorities and related functions of the Division of Small Craft Harbors. First of all, I would like to say that it is our feeling that the bond issue in as substantial an amount as 602, would provide the much-needed funds for development of our State recreational resources. The Division of Small Craft Harbors was formed in 1957 as the State's boating agency. I might add that this was tremendous foresight on behalf of our State Legislature inasmuch as the bill which brought many other states to their senses was not passed until 1958. With this head start our division has been delegated the responsibility and authority for the advancement and development of all types of boating facilities. Thus far participation in the construction of these greatly needed facilities has amounted to over 15 million dollars. The expenditure of these funds has been for the purpose of meeting the demands of recreational boaters whether they be fishermen, water skiers or just the family out on a cruising trip. This has been throughout the entire length and breadth of California.

The legislative intent in instituting a single boating agency was promulgated through the post-war boom in boat ownership.

You will notice from the statistics that I passed to you that the boating registration is increasing daily in each of your counties. We realize that 1959 was a peak year. We also realize that in 1960 it leveled off. However, it is again greatly increasing. This boom has resulted in 300,000 registered boat owners in California and some 40 million boating participants throughout the United States.

I might comment again that both Charlie DeTurk and Mr. Nelson in Sacramento have said that the greatest need expressed by the people for any type of facilities was boating facilities. The Division has as recently as the 1961 legislative session been delegated further authority relative to providing for the ever-increasing water oriented recreational demands of the State. In this 1961 session Senate Bill 815 specifically directs the Division to grant funds for the construction of launching facilities and trailer access units on both coastal and inland waters. Senate Bill 815 met with the warm reception from the 1961 Legislature and thus far the demands for such funds from local agencies has been so great that the Division is undergoing an accelerated program in developing rules and regulations for the issuance of these grants. The bill also provides for the development of much-needed harbors of refuge along our 1200-mile coastline.

I might further point out at this time that Assembly Bill 261, the Davis-Dolwig Act, regarding fish and wildlife and recreation in connection with State water projects designates Small Craft Harbors Division as the boating agency for consultation

and coordination.

Small Craft Harbor bonds were authorized to provide 10 million dollars of the 15-million-dollar total the Division has in loanable funds to the cities, counties and districts in 1958. Loans from this bond money are for the purpose of acquiring, constructing and generally maintaining small craft harbors and are repaid from revenues derived from these harbors.

Small Craft Harbor bonds have been one of the leading sellers of all those included in the California bonding program and the interest rate received is one of the lowest ever achieved.

Now, I might give an example at this point. If the Division was authorized through Senate Bill 602 to build launching facilities and trailer access units as outlined in the Division of Beaches and Parks five-year plan, we estimate the provision of launching facilities would cost approximately 7 and a half million dollars. This estimate is based on the need for approximately 375 launching facilities. There again this is from the Beaches and Parks five-year plan for the number of facilities required.

Our part in this program should also enhance development of both coastal and inland accesses, primarily for recreation of waterway use. Through the recent State governmental reorganization the Small Craft Harbors as a division of Parks and Recreation will serve to complement both State and Federal recreational waterway development programs. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of Mr. Richards?

Thank you very much. I appreciate having you here and especially do we appreciate the fact we crowded you out of our Sacramento meeting and forced you to come down here. Happy to have you with us there. I want to call on Mr. Raymond Nesbit. You be seated, Mr. Nesbit, give your name and official position for the record and proceed.

MR. NESBIT: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Ray J. Nesbit and I am coordinator for the Wildlife Conservation Board. I am also speaking for the Director of the Department of Fish and Game who is a member of this board, Mr. Walter Shannon, who could not be here today.

The Wildlife Conservation Board is involved in the field of recreation through specific Fish and Game Code sections. The Board was established by legislative enactment in 1947. Section 1345 provides that the Board shall investigate, study and determine what areas are most essential and suitable for wildlife production and preservation and will provide suitable recreation. Section 1351 provides that each recreational area shall be so managed and controlled that the public shall have access to and use of the area for all recreational purposes.

Other code sections provide for acquisition of lands and waters and for the construction, management and maintenance of the facilities. Such construction, management and maintenance may be accomplished by either the Department of Fish and Game or by contract and agreement with local agencies of government.

We believe that fish and game programs and recreation

related thereto should continue through the Wildlife Conservation Board as presently authorized. If, however, a bond issue provides for local assistance, the existing authority and procedures would permit expenditure of bond funds in an expanded program. Such an expanded program through the use of bond funds should be supplemental to the present program authorized for the Wildlife Conservation Board.

Bond issue funds, if made available to local government, should not be competitive with existing programs. It is very important that funds made available under any new program not offer local government a choice to the extent that one State program would be competing with another or that an existing successful State program be jeopardized.

Under existing policies of the Wildlife Conservation Board, local assistance projects are undertaken with the State establishing the recreational facility under agreements by which local government entities assume operation and maintenance of the State facility. This pattern of local assistance by the State has proved most successful and acceptable to the local agencies involved. The amount of expansion under a local assistance program is limited in many counties by their ability to underwrite the operation and maintenance costs.

The Director of the Department of Fish and Game has asked me to tell you of his support for a State Park bond issue. He points out that legislation of the last session authorized the Division of Beaches and Parks to establish recreational areas

upon which hunting can be considered. This ties in, more than ever before, the Beaches and Parks and the Fish and Game program. The sportsmen of California could benefit greatly by this bond issue through acquisition of recreational areas.

As Coordinator of Wildlife Conservation Board, it is my recommendation that if a local government assistance program is authorized reasonable amounts of bond money be made available to the Wildlife Conservation Board over a 10-year period for opportune purchases of land for public access sites and other projects of a high priority. Many such sites , if not acquired during this period, would be unavailable in the future. Development of these projects to be financed through regular WCB funds and maintained and operated by local governmental entities.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of Mr. Nesbit? Mr. Nesbit, one question, please. The wildlife money then as you propose it here would be used for the development and the Conservation Board would use some of the bond moneys for acquisition, is that correct?

MR. NESBIT: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Then what about the operation of the project after it has been acquired and developed? That would be done with license money?

MR. NESBIT: No, the operation, Mr. Chairman, would be entirely by local government. We now have about one hundred projects in the State that are operated and maintained by local government at no cost to the State.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: You referred to the pheasant farm in Tulare County for example?

MR. NESBIT: No, I'm referring mainly, Senator Williams, to access developments, to reservoir developments. There are about 18 reservoirs in the State that we have under agreement that have been developed. Several of them have been mentioned I believe in this hearing and previous hearings. For instance, someone mentioned the Whittier Narrows development down here. The Wildlife Conservation Board put \$500,000 into developing fishing lakes in conjunction with the County of Los Angeles. On Isabella in Kern County there was a quarter of a million dollars in that and a good many small local access projects, boat ramps and parking areas, access to hunting and fishing areas.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Fine. Thank you very much. Let me ask again, any questions of Mr. Nesbit? Thank you very much, Mr. Nesbit. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. I want to call on Mrs. Helen Roark, please. Would you be seated, Mrs. Roark, and give your name and your official position here for the record, please?

MRS. ROARK: I appreciate very much being given the opportunity of saying a few words here this afternoon. Mr. Chairman and Honorable Committee and all the Ladies and Gentlemen who are here today to hear what is said on this important subject --first my name is Mrs. Helen Roark and I am a farm owner in San Luis Obispo County, California.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Would you care to tell us your

name prior to becoming Mrs. Roark?

MRS. ROARK: I was for a long time in sports. Tennis was my game.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Would you give us your name then?

MRS. ROARK: It was Helen Wills. I still play tennis.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: I wanted to bring that out for the benefit of the guests in the audience here. This is the former Miss Helen Wills.

MRS. ROARK: I have spent a great deal of time out of doors as you may well imagine, and I believe that the recreational facilities of the State should be developed but under a plan in which there is no imposition upon the taxpayer. Now, I have noticed in this meeting that there has been no mention so far of the taxpayer in this State. The taxpayer votes as well as other people.

Now, I feel that the cost of this great bond issue which has been described at this meeting is too great at this time a burden for the taxpayer of this State. There is a danger in overburdening the State's capacity for land development. Now, a bond issue is really the assuming of a debt. The borrowing by the State does not avoid payment. It just postpones it and who pays the debt in the end, the taxpayer. Now, extravagance in government is something that we must guard against at this time in the history of our country, especially the irresponsible use of the taxpayers' money. The State already owns some 700 acres of

undeveloped land. Why should it buy more at this time?

Now, there is another point of great interest that I would like to make that has not been brought up at this meeting and it is something that is important to every American. The method of acquiring land through the procedure of Eminent Domain being used by public agencies so much today is contrary to the basic American right to buy, sell and own property, and this is the basic test of freedom. Any time that any public agency uses the procedure of Eminent Domain, condemns someone's land and gives him a price that they say is fair, but that may not be fair, deprives him of a right of an American citizen. Also this plan for taking such enormous amounts of property for beaches and parks, takes thousands of acres off the tax rolls and the taxes must be raised on private property to make up for it. Now, there is a very interesting comment by one of the great Constitutional writers in this country named Clarence Manion who was former Dean of Notre Dame's law school and he says, and this appeared in the Los Angeles Times: "The right to buy and sell and own is the basic test of freedom. In addition the unbridled use of Eminent Domain by the various government agencies takes hundreds of thousands of acres of land off the tax rolls every year. Thus the property left has to pay additional taxes." He was speaking at that time to the California State Realty Association. He said, "Big organizations like this one should fight to have the right of Eminent Domain made a legal question debatable in the courts. At the

present time a citizen has no right to question the purpose of such condemnation, whether it is lawful or not. The only protest a citizen can have legally is concerning the amount of money he is to receive."

Now, there is a certain lack of respect for ownership of private property shown today in Washington and as well in Sacramento and as well at the lower level of the counties. Recently taxpayers in a certain district in San Luis Obispo County were badly burned by a procedure of Eminent Domain against a property owner and they find that they are paying \$200,000 to date and have nothing to show for it. Here is the protest by these taxpayers printed in the San Luis Obispo Telegram Tribune signed "Taxpayers Who Demand Relief".

Now, in this action which is a very interesting one and establishes a precedent about coastlands, the public agency of the county, which was legal in every sense, using Eminent Domain procedures condemned approximate one and one-half miles of beach for county use which included a yacht club. Now, they said, this public agency of the county, that the fair value for the land was \$25,000. But the owner was not satisfied with this and he went to court and the jury as a fair price set \$707,000. Now, there is a difference there of about \$600,000 and that is quite a difference between two fair prices. The trial costs of this suit were \$153,000 and also there was to be paid \$60,000 for the lawyers who represented the county agencies. Now, needless to say the county has given up its attempt to acquire this property as it

has run out of money, but this property owner had to put up a great fight and he did.

Now, if the State bond issue does pass that is mentioned in this meeting, there will be many battles along the coast of San Luis Obispo County. I speak of that county because I know the county. There are 38 miles that the State hopes to acquire there and who will pay for these battles in the end, the taxpayers. The reason I mention 38 miles is because that is the figure here in this book which is entitled, "The Amended Master Plan of Shoreline Development for San Luis Obispo County, California," adopted by the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors on the 20th day of July, 1959. Here we see up to January, 1959, the county owns seven miles of coast frontage, the State thirteen miles, and the Federal Government one mile. I'm not giving the fractions. The total in public ownership was twenty-two miles of shoreline. Now, in this revised master plan, the plan is that the State will acquire 38 more miles of the shoreline which will give it a total, the State and public agencies, a total of 61 miles of the shoreline of San Luis Obispo County. Now, that is a huge amount of shoreline. The total beach frontage of San Luis Obispo County is 87 miles so that the proposed plan will have 65 percent of the shoreline of San Luis Obispo County in public ownership.

At a public meeting in Cambria in San Luis Obispo County on June 29, 1961, I heard Mr. DeTurk say in answer to a question, that the State hoped to acquire 65 percent of the shoreline of

San Luis Obispo County as well as the necessary upland property to go with it.

Now, I have with me here a map showing the shoreline of San Luis Obispo County. Now, this represents 87 miles. 65 percent of this is planned to be under public ownership which I as a taxpayer believe is too much, too large a percentage. Now, I do not want to take too long because you have been kind enough to allow me these few words. In Mr. DeTurk's last visit to Los Angeles he proposed that two and one-half million acres in California be set aside for public use, all to be paid for by the taxpayers who at present are staggering under such a load of taxes that they can scarcely bear. We taxpayers of California should say the same thing as the man in the Ozarks said when Mr. Udall, the Secretary of the Interior, came there, "We want people to come and enjoy our country, but we don't want it to become one big playground." That sounds like Communism, and we must not forget that the right to own property without harassment and without the unbridled use of the procedure of Eminent Domain and condemnation by government is a basic freedom that belongs to every American citizen.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Does that complete your statement now?

MRS. ROARK: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness?
Senator Cameron has a question, Mrs. Roark.

SENATOR CAMERON: Yes. Mrs. Roark, we are not

authorized to take up the subject of Eminent Domain, but of course in any bond issue that would be implied. I think that is why you brought it up, but we are interested, too, in property. Sometimes in areas with increasing population demands you find rather difficult things in property. In the Central Sierras where we have large stands of merchantable timber, we have wonderful streams, it is impossible to police them. There are thousands of people camping creating fire hazards, destroying private property, destroying some of our forests because they have no place to go. The maintenance of camp grounds that are adequately protected in effect protects those people's property, which are just impossible to police. This happens. Another one, indirectly, but one of the most beautiful lakes in the northern hemisphere is Lake Tahoe. That shoreline is owned, not wholly but almost wholly by private interests and that in a sense is all right for the ones who got there first, but I'm not talking about the ordinary public, I'm talking about the taxpayers who live in San Francisco and Los Angeles and they own cabins up there away from the lake and yet they have difficulty in getting to enjoy the body of water and the water itself is public. It is not private, but the access to it, because there isn't enough in public ownership limits the growth of Lake Tahoe for more people and so sometimes the use of sea front, water frontage, does not--it hurts the person it takes it away from individually, but it makes it better for more property owners who live behind, and you find when this is done that more private development

goes in. The taxes are increased as long as there is development along with the acquisition. This does happen and I thought perhaps--I mention it because we do have a problem with these hordes of people in this State now not being able to police areas and they go out everywhere. Even in the farming areas now, and incidentally in my own area the farmers there are cautious and changing, but they are beginning to see they are having so much trouble with trespass that some of them now want places so they won't bother their farms.

MRS. ROARK: Well, Mr. Cameron, I feel that you are a very persuasive speaker and I see here that you authored the bill during the last Legislature calling for a 75-million-dollar recreational bond issue, but that you added now and this is quoted from the Telegram Tribune newspaper, "He also added that his original 75-million-dollar figure is just a starting point. He said that perhaps even 150 million or even 200 million dollars would be more in line." Now, I want to finish, please. I say that I'm not against a fair purchase of property for recreational use, but I am against any big figures thrown around in an extravagant way and I represent many taxpayers in California and I'm sure we all feel the same.

SENATOR CAMERON: Did you hear my opening remarks here?

MRS. ROARK: Yes, I did.

SENATOR CAMERON: And I think the quote was in relation to the fact that the bill was only put in as a skeleton

to call attention to this. I don't think anyone yet can make up his mind as to what the size should be. We have to balance need and what the load can be, and I don't think any member of this Committee can say now what the bond issue should be. It may be 200 million dollars. Whatever the Committee thinks is economically justified for the State today and in the future, the Committee will recommend. This is why we are having the hearings. I don't know.

MRS. ROARK: I see. I have brought my protest here to this meeting because as a taxpayer I am against extravagance in this State.

SENATOR CAMERON: I am, too.

MRS. ROARK: And so are many people and they may defeat this bond issue if we all get out and work if it is too extravagant.

SENATOR CAMERON: I agree entirely and I'm absolutely against any extravagance, but I think we all have to look ahead and if a judicial expenditure of money will preserve and save money in the future, I think it is our duty to do it. That is what we are trying to find out.

MRS. ROARK: Extravagance is never judicial.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, Mrs. Roark. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Thank you.

MRS. ROARK: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: I want to call on J. H. Tedder. While Mr. Tedder is coming up, I would like to read into the

record a short letter addressed to the Chairman. This is dated December 5, addressed to the Chairman and reads as follows:

"Visalia Sportsman's Association"

"Visalia, California"

December 5, 1961

"Senator J. Howard Williams, Chairman
Senate Fact Finding Committee
on Natural Resources
408 State Capitol
Sacramento 14, Calif.

"Dear Howard:

"The members of the Visalia Sportsmen's Assn., Inc., at our last meeting of November 24, 1961, discussed Senate Bill 602 and Senate Constitutional Amendment 15 of the 1961 Session relating to a bond issue for the acquisition and development of beaches, parks, recreational and historical sites.

"The members feel that Senate Bill 602 and Senate Constitutional Amendment 15 are both good pieces of legislation.

"The members feel that the people of the State should be afforded the opportunity to vote on these two issues. It was felt that possibly there should be two bond issues, one for the acquisition of land and one for development of the lands. It is felt the acquisition of the land is not sufficient, but that there must be money available for the development of these acquired lands.

"Yours truly,

"Donald D. Conner

"Acting Sec."

If there is no objection that will be part of the Committee's file. Now, Mr. Tedder, if you will please proceed.

MR. TEDDER: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the Western Council of Trailer Clubs represents directly many of the recreational travel trailer clubs in Southern California in particular that find it extremely difficult to find overnight parking or camping space while traveling or vacationing, and particularly the group area campgrounds needed for trailer club outings which are usually planned once a month year-round here in the southwest. Such outings are family affairs with the children using the travel trailer or pickup camper for a full week-end in the open. We also attempt to fairly represent the unaffiliated trailerists and our tourist guests from out of state. I'll make no recommendation on whether a bond issue should be passed or not to cover the cost of land acquisition and park development. These remarks are intended to help guide this Committee to reach a decision as to how State Park funds should be spent.

Considering the size of the population, wealth and recreational potential of California, we are far behind where we should be. We have practically no roadside rest programs. Counties heavily populated like Los Angeles have so few overnight parks that week-end camping is given up by those who cannot range widely in search of space. Other sparsely populated counties cannot afford to operate parks for guests from across county lines.

Group camping including trailer club outings is not being used to best advantage due to lack of space. Clubs are now using the new mobile home parks not adapted to this type of use for week-end recreational gatherings. These problems are with us now and the taxpayers who will be paying the interest load on a bond issue are looking to us for relief now. I respectfully recommend that the State adopt a balanced program which will provide for both purchase of new park lands and the improvement of a balanced system of parks.

The State should take the lead in establishment of camping and recreational trailer parking areas, group campgrounds included, since a high percentage of such use is by residents or tourists traveling great distances. If it is not practical or intended that this be done now, then State recreational lands should be made available to private enterprise for a controlled type of overnight camping or trailer parking development. The latter, of course, may be advised due to the fact that such park sections are a form of housing and that much criticism and friction develops around competition between the State and private operators of trailer parking, particularly. Private development would eliminate use of State funds for this particular purpose thus making the money available for other uses and private developers may be able to develop at much lower cost thus eliminating waste of taxpayers' funds. We find that the Federal government has had to make this change in the Mission 66 program covering the National parks and monuments. Governmental development of camp

grounds and trailer parks upon completion of two parks turned out to be costing over double what a private operator could afford to spend and still show a profit. I understand the program was stopped, that a private developer may be called in to complete the work and that if this done, the work can be done at a fraction of the cost. The work may not be exactly the same, but they will be good parks and highly acceptable to us, the users. There are also operational problems in State Parks where use is attempted by groups. The State so far has been reluctant to consider overnight use by groups. For this reason I recommend that any group areas allowed may be in better hands if operated by the interested groups or a service could be set up for that purpose and backed by the users. The idea is not new. All of our youth camps are built around this principle. Since preparing this statement I would like to amend one statement I formerly made. I do believe that I would support the idea of a large bond issue. After listening to the evidence here today I feel that perhaps a bond issue would be the best way to go in acquiring the land needed for park purposes, but I still maintain my former statement that the over-all picture, the over-all program should be a balanced program. After all, you have the problems of selling the taxpayers of the State. I'm a user, a potential user, let's put it that way. I have been turned away more times than I have been allowed inside of a State Park. Now then, as a taxpayer I might be more willing to obligate myself to my share of payment on a bond issue or the interest

load on that bond issue if I got something out of the park system that I personally wanted. So I'm whole-heartedly in favor of a balanced program including both development and the acquisition of the lands. Do you have any questions?

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness? Senator Cameron has a question.

SENATOR CAMERON: In this area, I'm learning. I have had some letters but there is so much I haven't read. I wondered in the ordinary overnight trailer camp facility, I assumed that this was probably adequately taken care of by private enterprise. Is there a shortage there?

MR. TEDDER: No, there is a certain point at which the private operator ceases to be willing to serve the recreational users. Most of the trailer park operators in business now along the coastline in particular don't care too much whether they serve an overnight trailer or not. They claim that with the rental that can be taken off on overnight space that it is not worth the time involved in serving that user. I don't support that view whole-heartedly, although I respect their problem. I still don't support that view because we have this problem. The trailers are being produced, thousands of them every year. 35 percent of the total trailer production is going into travel units that are used, many of them for recreational purposes. Now then, they would like to use the coast highway. I have been told by our people up north in Oregon and Washington that in the vacation season, the summertime, they avoid Highway 101 and Highway 1

because they have been warned beforehand it is almost hopeless to find accommodations. So this lack of overnight facilities on our major coast highways and in our major recreational areas such as Palm Springs and Sequoia, Yosemite, the coastline of Los Angeles, a lot of those areas are losing their potential users because they cannot accommodate them with the type of facility they would like to have.

SENATOR CAMERON: As I understand it then, you feel that if some of this land is owned by the State where there is a large demand for the trailer parks that the State could under concession or lease to a private enterprise make revenue enough to cover operating costs. Is that about it?

MR. TEDDER: That is exactly it. I could take 5 acres or 10 acres on the coastline within 100 miles of Los Angeles, lease it from the State paying the State a return from the use of that land, agree to certain terms which would insure that the park would be used for recreational purposes--I don't mean mobile homes used for residential purposes, could set up a time schedule of time limit on reservations so that the use would be widely spread in the summer, possibly allowing a longer period of stay in the fall when our out-of-state guests are here. I could assure a profit on the operation, build that accommodation with private funds, and put the property after it is developed on the tax rolls.

SENATOR CAMERON: Does your organization have any idea--maybe someone has--of the number that may be involved as

far as people or units that use this--in other words, how many are we dealing with approximately?

MR. TEDDER: Well, the organized trailer clubs, most of them in Southern California, represent well over 3,000 family units. We have the Long Beach trailer club represented here today that has over 200 families in one club alone. One of my supporting clubs is the Wally Byam Club that numbers 4,000 trailers, trailers produced by one factory alone. They run in caravans numbering in hundreds of families at a time. We had a rally at Palm Springs the 18th of November at which 1200 trailer families gathered on the polo grounds in Palm Springs. It was an overflow crowd, the biggest turnout we had ever had. Any time that Trailer Clubs of America has a rally there is usually 100, 200, 300 families coming in a bunch. It is impossible to anticipate the use we would have if we had proper facilities. We are just scratching the surface insofar as possibilities are concerned.

SENATOR CAMERON: You sort of take your campsite with you, the basic units of the campsites with you?

MR. TEDDER: That is right. We need an improved camp ground. Unfortunately there is a sanitation problem involved in trailer parking. There is drain water which must be accommodated, so actually what is needed is an improved campsite which could be used by a tent camper, could be used by a man with a pickup camper or a recreational trailer. It is that flexible.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions of this

witness?

SENATOR ARNOLD: I have a question. You mentioned one trailer club--I don't recall the number of members you had. You said they were all using the same kind of trailer. Is that correct?

MR. TEDDER: I'm sorry.

SENATOR ARNOLD: Using the same kind of trailer.

MR. TEDDER: Oh, yes, the Wally Byam Caravan Club are all Air-Stream owners and their one club alone numbers over 4,000 members.

SENATOR CAMERON: Are these clubs organized by the manufacturer or is it just--

MR. TEDDER: In that case it is. It is practically the only club of any size sponsored by the manufacturer to the point of putting money in their recreational program. The rest of the clubs are mostly self-supporting, assessing an annual dues of roughly 5.00 or \$6.00 a year to cover the cost of a bulletin and certain minor costs.

SENATOR ARNOLD: This is my first experience with trailer clubs. I never was acquainted with it at all. What are the advantages of belonging to a trailer club?

MR. TEDDER: Well, one of the chief advantages is that they plan the program for us. Living in Los Angeles, working in Los Angeles, and thinking of going out for the week-end, it is almost impossible for the individual on a Friday night after work, after dark, to take the wife and several children out to some

unknown park hoping to get space. I have taken groups into the Salton Sea State Park and the Anza Borrego State Park and have been turned away after dark with women and children on my hands charged with the problem of finding space for them, so the chief function of the trailer club is to find places for outings, plan the trip, put out a bulletin giving all the details, outlining the program, the equipment needed, giving directions for finding the location, and having a reservation made in advance so that they would know they would have the space when they got there. They also then have a program chairman, a wagon master, who handles the policing of the grounds. We appoint whatever help is needed to plan and operate a good week-end gathering. Now, this is a family recreation which includes the smallest of the children. We operate our own youth program and I believe considering the fact that it is two full days in the open with the family making use of land in many cases that is not good for anything else, and not being tied to the shoreline, that we offer the greatest opportunity for high-class family recreation. It is a movement that cannot be ignored.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? Thank you very much. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony.

MR. TEDDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Is Dr. J. M. Kolisch here to speak for the Pines to Palms Wildlife Committee? Is there anyone here to speak for the United Humane Front Organization?

The next person I want to call is Burt L. Anderson. You be seated, Mr. Anderson, and give your name and your official position for the record.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Burt Anderson. I am Executive Secretary of the California Park and Recreation Society with headquarters in Glendale, California. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would like to extend my congratulations to the Committee and the State Legislature for their continued interest in the welfare of our people. We have just a very brief comment that we care to read, and if I may--

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: You have the floor, sir. You go right ahead.

MR. ANDERSON: As Executive Secretary of the California Park and Recreation Society, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee on behalf of our membership which comprises over 1000 professional park and recreation personnel employed in cities, special districts, counties, school districts, hospitals, Armed Forces as well as lay boards, commissions, citizen groups and others vitally concerned with recreation and park development in our State.

This society has consistently supported State legislation affecting the development of parks and recreation beginning with State legislation, resulting in the establishment of the California State Recreation Commission in 1947. In 1957, the society took a definite stand in supporting the bill authored by Assemblyman

Lloyd Lowery establishing the California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan Committee and used its good offices in interpreting the need for the plan on a local level, and in fact, gathered data which resulted in the publication which defined recreation and park needs on a local, regional and state-wide basis.

The proposed bond issue for the acquisition and development of state parks, recreational and historic sites is the next logical step in the implementation of the California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan. We believe that not only is the acquisition of land of prime importance for the needs of future citizens, but the development of existing park areas is also essential in providing for the needs of today's citizens.

We further believe that an amount of money beyond the proposed \$75,000,000.00 would be approved by the citizens of the State if the legislation creating the bond issue included acquisition, development, and an equitable state-wide apportionment of funds.

Parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, I made a note here a while ago that if the 16 million people in California were involved with the 200-million-dollar bond issue together with the interest, we would pay approximately per year per capita between 60 cents and 75 cents per year. I thought that might be interesting. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness? We do appreciate having you here and having your testimony.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. The next witness I want to call is Mr. S. W. Bridgers. Is Mr. Bridgers in the audience? He has left a statement here which will be placed in the transcript at the conclusion of the hearing. Mr. Bridgers represents the California Council of Landscape Architects and has a Los Angeles address. The next witness is Mr. Arthur D. Johnson, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs. Is Mr. Johnson here? Or is there someone to speak for him? Mr. Oliver Pryor. Mr. Pryor, come forward, please. Be seated, Mr. Pryor and give your name and official position, who you represent, for the record and then proceed with your statement.

MR. PRYOR: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Oliver Pryor. I am Secretary-Treasurer of the Wilsona Gardens Mutual Water Company. We are building a county water district with the aid of the Davis-Grunsky money. We are located surrounding one of the parks, the State parks, the Joshua Tree State Park. I have listened here to the pros and cons of this presentation or these presentations here and I represent 145 landowners representing 3,240 acres that would vote 100 percent for the acquisition of more lands to our park or to any suitable place which the State thought proper to acquire plus a large portion to be used for the development of the park. We have a park up there that could have been created 10 years ago for \$1.50 an acre. Some of the acquisitions cost 300 bucks an acre 10 years later. Right across the street from the park

is approximately 1,000 acres of the finest Joshua trees', bigger Joshua trees than are in the National park down here that can be acquired for much less at this time than they would say 10 or 20 years from now. I'll give you a fair example. The park acquired an 80-acre parcel which they could have bought for 25 bucks an acre 10 years ago, and they paid \$300 an acre. Now, that is 1200 percent right there. Now, number 3 of the overall plan for the Antelope Valley District, there is a projected population of 750,000 people. That would represent 290 persons to the acre of this present park that we have there. Now, we are anxious, of course, there is a little selfish anxiousness about us. We are anxious to promote more customers in the area and we do believe having spoken to the park attendant there, the ranger, that this park if they had sufficient money to develop we'll say one section of that park, that there would be hundreds more people come to the park. In all the presentation here, there hasn't been one word said about the people in these cities that have a little jalopy that can't go out with the trailer or can't go out and go in a hotel or go to a motel, but they do need to go to a State Park where they can pull their old jalopy in and sit down in a camping area in a State Park, and there are hundreds and thousands of that kind of people here. We aren't all millionaires, you know. These people have to be protected, too. And incidentally they are taxpayers, too, because they have little slips given to them at the end of their month's wages saying how much Uncle Sam has taken away from them.

Now, they may not own a thousand acres or 5,000 acres, but they still pay taxes.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Is there anybody around here that doesn't? I would like to take a look at him.

MR. PRYOR: And incidentally, let me say this much, that all the people I represent don't have a bucket of dirt to sell, not to the park or anybody else. They want their land and want to keep their land, so it is not a selfish viewpoint on our part to present this case of getting sufficient money for the development of the park and the acquisition of more land. Of course, in regard to the water, we have other areas or other agencies to contact on that and we have a legal firm taking care of that, but we do want as taxpayers and as citizens and there are at least 300 voters out there that are willing to pay the bill and their share of the bill. We want to thank the Committee and we want to notify this Committee that we have every confidence in the people we send up there to Sacramento with an X on the ballot, whether ours gets in or the other one gets in. The majority sent them there and we think they sent them there to do a job and I don't propose and I don't think the average layman can propose to handle that situation. We leave it directly up to you gentlemen and you, Madame. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness?
Senator Quick has a question, Mr. Pryor.

SENATOR QUICK: Where is Joshua Park located?

MR. PRYOR: It is at North 170th Street east in

the Antelope Valley. Now, the Antelope Valley is in a very fine situation. In 1950 the population up there was about 3,942 people in Lancaster and 979 in Palmdale. Palmdale has 16,000 now and Lancaster has well over 35,000 and I mean we are all go-getters up there and we want to see the thing progress and now is the time to acquire that land because Heavens to goodness, right outside of Lancaster there are four or five big farms have been bought up and held by developers at \$3,000 and \$4,000 an acre, and they are just sitting on it.

Now, as far as the taxpayers are concerned, our land around there is taxed--the rate of assessed value is \$15.00 an acre. Now, you are not going to take much taxes away from Los Angeles if you took the whole thing up there, but if you acquire the land there, the amount of population right on this report, number 3 of the Los Angeles County, it states right in our little group there in that little area of 3,000 acres, they show 5,000 population. You will have 5,000 taxpayers there by 1980. That is the horizon year projected on this report, and the more development there is in those parks--I'm not speaking only of the Joshua Tree State Park, because there are a lot of people just don't like Joshua trees. My son is one of them.

SENATOR QUICK: One further question. I believe you said to being with that your club or your park area up there would support this measure if it was on a development basis as well as a purchase basis.

MR. PRYOR: That is right.

SENATOR QUICK: I wanted to correct that because later you said some 300 people out there would vote for it regardless, but you didn't express this development angle again.

MR. PRYOR: Well, I will also draw in that other comment that I made that when we vote for our legislators we believe they are capable of doing the job, whatever they set up to do.

SENATOR QUICK: I appreciate that, but I wanted to see if I was correct.

MR. PRYOR: Yes, that is correct. We would like to see the park developed and I presume that Mr. DeTurk is taking care of that matter, too.

SENATOR QUICK: He surely is.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Senator Cameron has a question, Mr. Pryor.

MR. PRYOR: Yes, sir.

SENATOR CAMERON: Glad you have that confidence, Mr. Pryor. We have to learn.

MR. PRYOR: I'm just the sugar in the coffee.

SENATOR CAMERON: We have to learn from the people, too, because there are so many things, but in your area, recreation is industry. It means jobs and spending money.

MR. PRYOR: That is right.

SENATOR CAMERON: When they took gold mining away from my district, we would have been through as counties up there

except for the recreation industry. One county found out that for every campsite the people spend from \$12.00 to \$17.00 a day in local business and we didn't have to build schools for the children. We had a good industry, a clean one, and we were providing a good service. Is that your position there, too?

MR. PRYOR: Yes, sir. May I add this comment? For 20 years I handled 2,000 units for the Federal Government as housing manager and 1500 trailers and the last comments by the gentleman that was here about the trailer, I think that is the capital idea that he has because then he can get his groups together and take them out to a place where they don't have to live by the roadside. I think it is a wonderful idea.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Pryor. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Mrs. Davis has a question.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS: I'm quite interested, Mr. Pryor, in the definition of a taxpayer. Did you notice that during the depression we learned by the default of rent and subsequent loss of property to public entities for non-payment of taxes that the real taxpayer after all was the rent payer. Did it ever dawn on you during the depression? In other words, the man on the property, if he couldn't collect rent, the renters were out of work, they couldn't pay their rent, in many instances they were evicted, but in turn the owner could not pay taxes and along comes the county and all the other political subdivisions moved in and took his property. Then the summation was that

without the rent payer there could be no taxpayer. Have you noticed that in England in all public improvements they just don't have taxpayers' associations. They have combined them. They don't call them taxpayers. They call them ratepayers. They have the Ratepayers and Renters Association because they are cognizant that they are so interdependent in the economic society we live in. The point is all your discussion brought out that the Joe Doe isn't the Joe Doe who possibly has no property but he pays his rent, he works, raises his family, tries to educate his children, pays his rent and the taxpayer in turn pays their taxes and poor Joe Doe in crowded metropolitan areas wants to get out and get some of God's sunshine and he really wants to walk down on the beach. Isn't that the summation of your endorsement of this bill?

MR. PRYOR: May I say that I was one of the first latch-key voters of the old Lloyd George budget in England and I understand very well what taxes are. Over there during the war they paid 45 cents on the dollar straight through and they are still living. In regard to the county acquiring the property, they have gone through that process down at our place because the land was so cheap, a dollar and a half an acre, that the taxpayer wouldn't even pay the taxes on that so they let it go back to the county or in some instances they had some law that was brought into effect in about 1951 or 1952 that wiped it off the slate, the back taxes. The fellows who hadn't paid taxes for 20 years on the lands that they owned--it was wiped off the slate

without the rent payer there could be no taxpayer. Have you noticed that in England in all public improvements they just don't have taxpayers' associations. They have combined them. They don't call them taxpayers. They call them ratepayers. They have the Ratepayers and Renters Association because they are cognizant that they are so interdependent in the economic society we live in. The point is all your discussion brought out that the Joe Doe isn't the Joe Doe who possibly has no property but he pays his rent, he works, raises his family, tries to educate his children, pays his rent and the taxpayer in turn pays their taxes and poor Joe Doe in crowded metropolitan areas wants to get out and get some of God's sunshine and he really wants to walk down on the beach. Isn't that the summation of your endorsement of this bill?

MR. PRYOR: May I say that I was one of the first latch-key voters of the old Lloyd George budget in England and I understand very well what taxes are. Over there during the war they paid 45 cents on the dollar straight through and they are still living. In regard to the county acquiring the property, they have gone through that process down at our place because the land was so cheap, a dollar and a half an acre, that the taxpayer wouldn't even pay the taxes on that so they let it go back to the county or in some instances they had some law that was brought into effect in about 1951 or 1952 that wiped it off the slate, the back taxes. The fellows who hadn't paid taxes for 20 years on the lands that they owned--it was wiped off the slate

and then they started all over again. But I think that if that park is developed and all the parks are developed correspondingly with this gentleman's statement about bringing groups to the State Parks for overnight services because that gentleman would tell you he doesn't like any overnight services in a trailer park because you have too much turnover there. Instead of having a 2 percent vacancy loss you would have a 25 percent vacancy loss, so I believe this much, that you will increase the taxpayers, not the taxes. We figured out what our loan would cost us and it would cost us on an average of \$5.00 an acre according to the law on the Davis-Grunsky Act--\$5.00 an acre over a period of 30 or 40 years--I'm not quite sure of it because the lawyers are handling that.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: And you claim that where there are recreational facilities, the valuation of the property goes up and the taxpayers benefit?

MR. PRYOR: That is right. Everybody benefits. There is another philosophy I have got, too, and that is that these mountain areas and all that should belong to the kids that are coming, my great-great grandchildren. What am I going to do? I have only probably about 15 minutes to live. I'm over 72 years of age now, so I'm interested in seeing that future generations have got something without paying 5,000 bucks an acre to expand that park when they come into being. There is the point.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: You are still a young man.

MR. PRYOR: My Dad lived to be 94. My mother-in-law

died last month. She would have been 99 tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Anyone else want to get into this debate about age? Thank you very much, Mr. Pryor. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. I will now call on Edward H. Walker, please. I believe you had a resolution. Would you be seated, please, and give your name and your position, who you represent for the record and then proceed.

MR. WALKER: I am Edward H. Walker, Park Superintendent of Riverside County and I would like to present just a short brief resolution adopted by our board of supervisors of Riverside County to your Committee and this is a resolution that was adopted one week ago this Monday. It is a resolution by the County of Riverside, "Be it Resolved by the board of supervisors of the County of Riverside, State of California, in regular session assembled on December 4, 1961, that this board of supervisors supports the principle of a State-wide bond issue for the acquisition and development of state parks and recreational areas.

"Be it Further Resolved that a true copy of this resolution be furnished to the Senate Interim Committee on Natural Resources, Senator L. M. Backstrand and Assemblyman Gordon Cologne."

That is the extent of my presentation, Gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. We appreciate having you here. Any questions?

SENATOR QUICK: Mr. Walker, I gather that you

represent quite a lot of the desert area in the southeastern part of the State of California?

MR. WALKER: I think at least I can say conservatively 65 percent of our county is that.

SENATOR QUICK: Do you think that it is equally important for recreation as mountain and beach area of California?

MR. WALKER: I might be classified as prejudiced, but I think it is more important, sir.

SENATOR QUICK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: What a way to get a plug into a committee hearing. Thank you, Mr. Walker. The next witness I want to call on is Dr. Henry M. Weber. Would you please be seated, Dr. Weber? You proceed.

DR. WEBER: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee and Ladies and Gentlemen, I am Dr. Henry M. Weber, Inyo, California. I am retired Commander of the Navy Medical Corps. I would like to make an observation on the testimony delivered by Mrs. Roark and also by Mr. Pryor. I'm also a taxpayer and I'm a taxpayer I can assure you whose shoe soles are pretty thin. However, there are two conditions which exist today that all taxpayers should take into consideration.

First, the unit of land per individual in California is shrinking every day. Secondly, we all know our weak dollar bill is shrinking every day. Now, those are two conditions which modify and certainly denote the urgency of a bond issue. However, I come here to speak principally on behalf of the 18,000 members

of the California Garden Clubs, Incorporated, who do approve of this legislation in principle as follows:

1. Acquisition of lands for use as State Parks should be realized at the earliest possible date. Land values are rising so rapidly that acquisition of many very desirable areas at a later date may be impossible. This reason alone makes the need for the bond issue an urgent one.

2. Inasmuch as State Park areas are for the use of all the people, whether their classification be historical, scenic or recreational, great care need be exercised that any use which would impair such enjoyment be prevented. This matter needs particular emphasis in view of the unfortunate passage of Senate Bill 353 during the recent legislative session which would permit shooting in future parks classed as recreational. This non-conforming use will prevent the enjoyment or use of the people's parks by 95 percent of those who would visit them at such times because public lands open to shooting are essentially closed to the public. This matter has been thoroughly explored in an article by a game management authority, Mr. G. W. Conwell, who is a professor of wildlife. He wrote an article in the American Forestry magazine on this subject. He pointed out that wildlife in State and National parks are without fear of man which permits their study, photography and general enjoyment. Any sort of hunting or shooting alters completely this relationship which for a large percentage of the visitors is their principal reason for attendance.

In the State of California there are approximately 80 million

acres open to hunting which is 80 percent of the total land area of the State. Certainly the 95 percent of the population who do not hunt, especially since they have been and will be the purchasers of all but a minimal percentage of the State Park land have every right to expect freedom from this non-conforming and hazardous use. I thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness? Thank you very much.

SENATOR ARNOLD: I would like to ask the doctor a question. As I recall this recreational area bill that you referred to here, it excluded present or future parks and this was very explicit in the legislation as it was finally adopted.

DR. WALKER: Yes, that is right.

SENATOR ARNOLD: And that these recreational areas where hunting would be permitted, there would be nothing else and there would be no interference with parks or the use of parks as parks. I don't know whether you were aware of that.

DR. WALKER: Yes, I was very well aware of that, but, Senator Arnold, I think you missed my point here. The point I make is that the situation in the park is completely altered when shooting of any kind is permitted. Now, I would suggest that members of this Committee read Mr. Conwell's article in the American Forestry magazine. It is a very concise and complete analysis of the thing which we are trying to do. I question that any member of this Committee would want to take his children into a park where hunting would be permitted and

I'll illustrate that by a personal observation.

SENATOR ARNOLD: This is the point I was trying to clarify. There will not be hunting in any present or future State Parks. Wherever there is hunting recreation area, they will not be used as a park. It will be exclusively as a hunting area.

DR. WALKER: Wasn't the bill, No. 353, to provide that at the discretion of the Director of Beaches and Parks, that hunting might be permitted in those parks classed as recreational?

SENATOR ARNOLD: I don't believe they referred to them as parks, Doctor. I think they said in his discretion there could be areas set aside as recreational areas for hunting purposes only.

DR. WALKER: Well, I would disagree with that thoroughly, Senator. What we are doing here then is setting up, you might say, a junior Department of Fish and Game underneath a State Parks and Beaches agency and that is simply out of place. We have a Department of Fish and Game which has been acquiring large areas of land and simply as a point of equity, I think all of you men should realize the fact that 5 percent of the population now have close to 80 percent of the State of California to hunt in. Now, that is hardly equitable. When you analyze it carefully, and surely since the bulk of the bonds in the bond issue will be bought by those people who enjoy wildlife for the purpose of photography and other purposes, you should take that into consideration. I certainly thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? Thank you very much. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony.

DR. WALKER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Mr. J. E. Drake. Is Mr. Drake here? Will you give your name, please, and who you represent for the record, please?

MR. ROGOWAY: My name is Ned Rogoway. I am here in behalf of Jesse E. Drake. Actually, I am wearing two hats. I'm the Planning Director of San Luis Obispo County and as such I'm speaking in behalf of the board of supervisors of that county and also I'm administrative assistant to Mr. Drake acting as President of the Shoreline Planning Association of California. Actually, the policies of these two organizations are quite similar and I'll not attempt to try to segregate each item as to how each of these feel. The Shoreline Planning Association incidentally has acted in behalf of jurisdictions throughout the State in attempting to sponsor or to assist and to coordinate developments of shoreline recreation. I'm going to talk about San Luis Obispo County primarily because this is the area about which I am most familiar, and I believe it typifies the status of many other counties in this State as far as recreational development and acquisition is concerned. I'm not here to take issue with Mrs. Roark. I believe that the board does agree with some of her points, but as a whole they support the bond issue.

I believe they would go so far as to support as much moneys

in this bond issue as would in the opinion of this Committee and the Department of Recreation and Parks as would not jeopardize the passage of this issue. San Luis Obispo County has a large stake in this because at the present time the recreational resources of the county and of the entire central coastal area have barely been tapped. And it represents a major industry in the county. As you might guess, it lies within camping radius of three metropolitan areas, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Fresno and would usurp much of the patronage use of the tourists that come from these areas. However, there is an extremely large deficit in recreational development in the county. There are only two operating campsites in San Luis Obispo County with about 110 camping units and this is extremely low for the amount of desire on the part of people to use these facilities. As a matter of fact, the county parks that offer campsites and so forth are now overrun with non-county residents of the State.

With the small population of these central coastal county areas, particularly in San Luis Obispo, the county itself, the county government is not able to afford to develop the facilities that are needed. They can assist, but they cannot afford to do it because of the low tax base, and we believe that the county has an obligation to provide recreational facilities only for the residents of that county and I believe most others feel the same way. However, we believe that the State has an obligation to provide the facilities for the traveling public. The Shoreline Planning Association and San Luis Obispo County actively support

this bond issue. As you know, there has been in the past a master shoreline plan program which has been used by the Division of Beaches and Parks to acquire and develop lands along the coastal areas. However, we of San Luis Obispo County and in the Shoreline Planning Association have observed that this program is now in jeopardy. Without funds for acquisition and particularly development, we can forget the expansion of shoreline recreation. It is obvious to our county that primary property owners are waiting for a weakening of the program before making legality attacks upon the master plan program. I believe Mrs. Roark cited one example that we found in San Luis Obispo. There are a few others and this all leads us to believe that unless something is done, some action is taken soon, the master plan programs for recreation that were submitted to the State in 1946 are definitely in jeopardy. The position of San Luis Obispo County was summarized in a letter which was written to Charles DeTurk on July 22, 1960, and I would like to read four paragraphs from that letter:

"About six months ago a request was presented to the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors to delete a portion of lands from the master plan of shoreline development. As the analysis of this request progressed it became apparent that a much greater question was at stake, to wit: How can requests of this type justifiably be denied when there is at present no stated intention to pursue the lands for public purposes? Our governing bodies, recognizing the urgent necessity for maintaining

some semblance of order in advance of the purchase and development of shoreline areas, have discussed over this period of six months the question that has been raised and a reasonable policy to follow until a more definite program is formulated. This report will attempt to summarize any appraisal of the question and resultant policy.

"We have observed a number of other major property owners anxiously waiting for a decision so that they too can request their properties be deleted from the master plan of shoreline development. Their contention is based upon this reasoning: 'Although it was the original intent of the program to purchase adequate shoreline areas as outlined in the plan, the time for this purchase has long passed. Even stated intention to purchase does not guarantee them public acquisition within a reasonable time; thus the normal development and use of the property is denied.' As far as we can ascertain the people who make up this faction constitute a major portion of those owning the remaining property to be acquired in the San Luis Obispo county master plan of shoreline development.

"The discussion between the board of supervisors and the planning commission reflected one basic thought. Without a definite program and without specific information that can be relayed to the property owners who seek utilization of their property, our position becomes more and more untenable. Irrespective of whether we can hold the line on the master plan until 1961, we still feel that a definite course of action must be

formulated so that we may be guided after the close of the current program. Otherwise, we will be faced with the urban development and subsequent loss of shoreline areas greatly needed by the people of the State of California."

There are the categories of need which the Shoreline Planning Association and the Board of Supervisors have asked me to present to you. They believe that expansive development of recreational resources where the need appears greatest is necessary, particularly outside of the metropolitan areas in the 100-mile to 250-mile belt and particularly in the field of overnight camping.

Development of roadside accommodations both overnight and day use should be made along major highways, preservation by easements or by acquisition of scenic and day use areas in jeopardy of immediate development, expansion and development of local recreational areas where non-local users are shown to be a large factor in its existence, and in that regard I am speaking of county parks and so forth where the patronage is primarily by out-of-county tourists.

Now, I have six recommendations to make here which I believe represent the feelings of the county and of the shoreline association. The first one is this: That there should be a comprehensive survey of all recreational resources to determine what areas are to be included in the State Park System. This means a re-evaluation of the master plans as they now exist in the Division of Beaches and Parks. Up to this point I don't believe that a survey of this

type has been made and I know for a fact that in our master plan there are many areas which I do not believe the State is interested in acquiring for some use.

The second recommendation is that there should be a pro-rated program covering several years with additional funds allotted the first year to facilitate completion of projects stalled in previous years because of lack of funds. I know of three or four that exist in our county and I believe that, for instance, if you have a pro-rated program of these funds lasting over 10 years that the first year should be in excess of the other years to pick up all of these things that were committed by the Division of Beaches and Parks so that they can be done soon. There are some that have been delayed some three or four years because of lack of funds and I think this should be done.

The third recommendation is this, that a program of assisting counties and local recreation areas where out-of-county patronage is an important factor should be instituted. This program could work like that which exists under the Wildlife Conservation Board which would allocate funds for projects where out-of-county users are predominant. And I don't believe that the facilities covered by the Wildlife Conservation Board should become a part of this program. They are dealing with access, both access, rental facilities and so forth, but they don't cover such things as camping, dredging, and things like this, and there is a void here.

The fourth recommendation is that a pool of funds should be reserved specifically to acquire lands in immediate danger of loss to the State through private development. These funds would be used only upon lands which are included in the various county master plans for future acquisition. At times a subdivision is filed over a piece of land contained in a master plan and funds should be made available so that these can be picked up ahead of even priorities farther down the list.

Fifth, I believe that there should be an expansion of the enroute campsite program to include provisions for wayside rests, day use areas and so forth at frequent intervals along major highways. This program has bogged down under the Division of Highways and should be reinstituted to where it will become an accomplished fact.

And sixth, I believe that the area of leasing State Parks for private recreational enterprises should be studied so that income can be derived through concessions and the like, but this should be studied very carefully and any concessions should be on a regulated basis.

Now, in the area of development and acquisition, I believe it is the stand of the Shoreline Planning Association and the Board of Supervisors that there is a definite need for development at the present time.

Projects that have been planned in the past have not been done. I believe they should be taken care of as soon as possible, and to set a figure as to how much funds should be for development,

how much for acquisition, is not within my prerogative, but I do feel that a very good percentage of these bond funds should be for development because the need is here now.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness?

Senator Quick has a question and then I'll recognize Senator Sturegon.

SENATOR QUICK: Do I understand that you feel that the State should come into a county and say they are going to do certain things?

MR. ROGOWAY: Are you speaking of the point where funds could be allocated to the county, sir?

SENATOR QUICK: In other words, what I'm trying to bring out is do you feel that the State should come into a county and say, we are going to do this and don't you think it will probably be advisable for the county to be considered in this connection?

MR. ROGOWAY: Oh, yes, sir. I believe it has been the policy of the Division up to this point and I don't see any reason to change this. Formulations of these master plans have been by the county and although there originally was intended to be a priority system to be on a coordinated basis between what the county's thinking is and the State's, and this has since kind of fallen by the wayside, I think it should be reinstituted and there should be a definite amount of coordination between the desires of the county and the desires of the Department.

SENATOR QUICK: Thank you.

SENATOR STURGEON: Mr. Rogoway, I would like for you to enlarge a little bit on your first recommendation on this survey going into a little bit of history, if you would, of how it actually works now. I think we are thinking about the same thing. It is where your county has a master plan and the State approves.

MR. ROGOWAY: Yes, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? I'm going to recess for 5 minutes for the benefit of the Reporter. Thank you very much. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. The Committee will stand in recess.

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: The Committee will please be in order. The next witness I want to call is Mr. Lloyd Tevis, Jr. Is he here? Is it Mrs. Tevis then? Would you be seated then and give your name?

MRS. READ: I am Mrs. Henry T. Read. I am the secretary of the Desert Protective Council and I am appearing in Mr. Tevis' stead. I'll read the testimony which he has written.

"We respectfully submit that:

"1. The bond issue for the acquisition and development of State Parks should have a definite provision to exclude sport hunting in all lands acquired through issuance of the bonds. Otherwise the Desert Protective Council may not be able to support it.

"The acquisition of land for hunting purposes comes most properly within the province of the California Department of Fish and Game. That agency already has taken effective steps by negotiating agreements with the United States Bureau of Land Management for withdrawal of much of the public domain in California for the benefit of wildlife and for use by sportsmen.

"Therefore it would be a wasteful duplication of effort for the Division of Recreation of the Department of Natural Resources to acquire land for hunting purposes. It should be concerned only with providing land for the recreational use of the 95% of the people of the State who, for all practical purposes, are excluded from hunting areas during the shooting seasons.

"2. There should be a provision in the bond issue to assure that a fair proportion of the funds will be used to acquire park lands in the desert.

"Because desert lands are less densely populated than some other parts of the State, there has been a tendency to overlook them in plans for expanding the State Park System. Actually the fact they are not overpopulated means that there is more unspoiled land of high scenic and historical value available in the desert than almost anywhere else in the State. But because of the population expansion now underway in the desert this situation will not prevail for long."

And that is by Lloyd P. Tevis, Jr., Chairman of the

Wildlife Committee, Desert Protective Council, by J. I. Read, Secretary.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, Mrs. Read. Any questions of this witness? Thank you. We appreciate having you here.

MRS. READ: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe I used 5 minutes. Mrs. Edmiston remarked about the desert lily preserve which is east of Desert Center. I don't know how much of that is in the public domain, but it is possible now I believe for the State Park Department to acquire as much as 64,000 acres of Bureau of Land Management land and I think that perhaps that could be taken under consideration. I haven't had a chance to check with the Bureau of Land Management on how much is in the public domain. It has been bulldozed as Mrs. Edmiston pointed out. Fortunately though, not last year, but the year before when we had some rains, the desert lilies did come up, but not in the same profusion because they grow rather deep. The bulbs are about 18 inches under the ground.

Then another area of importance is the Castle Dunes area. There is one question I would like to ask about this bond issue if I may ask a question.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Senator Cameron, do you want to answer this question?

SENATOR CAMERON: Sure.

MRS. READ: As Mr. Tevis said in his statement here, the acquisition of lands for park purposes, what percentage

would be used for these recreational areas for hunting purposes?

SENATOR CAMERON: According--

MRS. READ: I mean--

SENATOR CAMERON: According to the present plans in the Department of Parks and Recreation, none. The hunting feature--this was a problem as to where to put it. I mean in one sense administratively I don't think we are set up properly, but this was looking ahead primarily to the development of the California Water Plan. Then there will be areas under the Department that will have no use except for perhaps fall hunting.

MRS. READ: Wouldn't that come under fish and game?

SENATOR CAMERON: Well, in one way, yes, and in one way, no. It is actually set up under the Department. The bill incidentally provides that the regulation of it is Fish and Game. This is an administrative thing that isn't really quite good, but for a number of historical reasons that exist it is the same way with the recreation development in a sense. We could set up a new division and put them in charge of recreation areas, but in my district and in other places in the State we have areas where we want to set aside part of it as scenic research, but maybe around it you have a body of water for camping, for swimming, for fishing, and we have another one where we may have part of it historical, so as a matter of practicality rather than to try to set up another Department doing one function and another one doing another, it was felt that one Department could better handle it and there is a lot of misunderstanding

of the intent of the legislation, and I am sincere in saying that the handling of it under the present Department will, I think, result in better land use completely.

MRS. READ: It was just a case of the board of directors of the Desert Protective Council meeting December 2 and this was discussed because we have been on record for years as being opposed to any hunting in the State Parks because of the danger to the other users of the State Parks.

SENATOR CAMERON: There was no law prohibiting that, and the law which was designed prohibits it. This is the first time. There was no law on it. This prohibits hunting in the State Parks past and future. It says only in a recreational area.

MRS. READ: We are just wondering how much of the bond issue will go for recreational areas. Thank you very much.

SENATOR CAMERON: So far none for hunting.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Mr. Ray Henning.

MR. HENNING: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am appearing as an individual. I have no axes to grind but I happen to have been Chief of the State Division of Beaches and Parks for a period of almost 10 years, and I thought that due to my interest in parks and recreation that I wanted to appear before you and I wish to make a few comments if I may. First of all, I am highly in favor of this bond issue and I believe it should be a minimum of \$150,000.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: \$150,000?

MR. HENNING: Yes, and I'll explain that if I may--150 million dollars, beg your pardon.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: We could hardly give you time if that is all you are going to talk about. You go right ahead.

MR. HENNING: In my opinion insofar as the southern counties are concerned, mainly the real south counties, Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego Counties, this will be the last bond issue that will ever be put before the people of California for recreational purposes based upon two conditions, acquisition and improvement, because after this money has been expended and 10 years have elapsed after that, if you want to create a bond issue for parks and recreational purposes, you will also have to put in that a fund for demolition. We are not going to have any areas of scenic beauty with the original terrain left. You are going to have to destroy and abolish improvements in order to get areas for these purposes.

I was amused at, I think it was Senator Quick, who asked the question as to where Joshua State Park was. It so happens that Joshua State Park is the only State Park in Los Angeles County. One other area has the name of park, the Will Rogers State Park, but it really is a shrine. I also wish to say this, that there is not a park, a camping area or a picnic area in Los Angeles County that is operated under the State. That may be a surprise to some of you people. I further wish to say

that I think you can go the limit on this particular bond issue and in so doing save almost an equivalent amount of expenditure on correctional institutions and penal institutions.

As George Hjelte mentioned to you here in the entire City of Los Angeles, there is just one baseball, complete official-sized baseball diamond available to youngsters, and unless you do provide more of these facilities, I'm sure that you are going to spend a greater amount than this on your correctional and penal institutions, and that plus one other measure is about all that I would like to present at this time unless there are questions.

I would like to have the Senator consider in the bill, or the entire Committee, consider in a bill when it is drawn up--as I said, I have no axes to grind. I don't know what proportion of the bill that will come out will be allotted to acquisition and what portion will be for improvements, but I do believe we are faced with these things. First of all, we want this bond issue to be presented to the public. Secondly, you want it carried. In order to have it carried, I think you can eliminate one objection that has been mentioned here several times and that is the present acquisitions have not been improved and that out of the money you set aside for improvement, you put something in there restricting a certain amount for the completion of improvements on already-acquired property. I believe that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of Mr. Henning? Thank you very much, Mr. Henning. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Mr. Tyler of Santa Monica, will you please come forward?

MR. TYLER: My name is John Tyler. Noting that Mr. Johnson of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs is not here, I would like to represent that organization of which I am a live member. And I would also speak for the Committee for the Preservation of Tule Elk. This covers a good deal of territory, but in general, may I say that these groups are family outing groups using recognized leaders in the sciences, geological sciences, and other interests like that. We go to quite a number of areas in the State as well as outside the State for education on a scientific basis. And it is not strictly a recreation group per se. I was uninformed of this meeting in time to make a formal presentation for you, but I do have some notes that I have made while I have been listening here this afternoon.

I wasn't able to get to the morning session. I would just like to point these out because they are within the spirit of these organizations. There are some things I think may give some trouble in the legislation, some of the ideas that have been brought forth such as the equitable distribution of funds is more dependent upon the worth of the area than whether or not it has a fair share of the funds being spread out throughout the State. I mean some people seem to feel that we should pork-

barrel this thing. I think it should be brought in mind, for example, that nature was a little sparing in some places and she was quite lavish other places, and what we need to do is consider this on a State-wide basis and where the areas are worth preserving they should be preserved. If there is no area worth preserving, then we spend a little time and gas going to the area that was worth preserving and that is preserved. If we wait too long, we will find that private use and exploiters of land have made it very difficult to acquire this land.

Now, this applies within the city as well as outside. In the City of Santa Monica where I reside, we have people trying to exploit things at all levels of life, but another point that has been brought up is continued re-evaluations of master plans and so forth. Well, all these things seem to do is delay the time to the point that soon our funds are just not going to accomplish what the original master plan would have done and if we get ahold of this land and find that we have made a mistake, if we have to say that we don't need this, we can sell this again or trade it and get ahead economically on a State-wide basis. And so the important thing is to get this land now when you can get it.

Many of the natural areas, for example, once they are gone, no matter how many bulldozers and improvements you bring into the thing, you are not going to be able to restore it. Wayside rests were mentioned and I think that they are a safety necessity and could very well come under the highway program.

It would not necessarily be based under parks and recreation. It might be for certain reasons that we might want to have the beaches and parks take care of this thing, but it would seem to me more economical for the Highway Department to maintain the roadside rests, but they are a safety feature in addition to the other values that they have and therefore should be considered I think under the highway use.

Now, one area that should be mentioned I think is the idea of separate bonds. People have been discussing here what percentage of this and what percentage of that should go one way or the other and I think that unless we are careful that we will find that the costs of development will be quite explosive on some of these things and we will be tempted to dip into the acquisition funds. We may find better uses and methods of development and the proper thing to do right now is to get what we can with the funds we have available, namely, acquisition and development to a certain extent. Federal land acquisition by the State was one economical means that certainly can be used. I don't know what the percent is per year that is allowable to us, but we should work this up as best we can, and I might mention this, that many of these areas say, "We can't have these things set aside because then we have no tax revenue," and that sort of thing. I think if we develop a program of development with these areas, that the local areas should be able to get some revenue out of the improvements and

the money spent at these recreational areas and that would take care of these people. In other words, the peripheral areas' development can have an economic benefit to them if it is properly oriented. Now, the areas of great interest to the nature conservationists is currently of low cost, but is highly exploitable by these people with 100 million dollars that can go in there and take a few bulldozers and convert any piece of land into any usage that they want and particularly I would like to point out the fact that swamps and lowlands of this type to many people are absolutely worthless, and yet they are the most highly-integrated nature developments probably that we have.

One of them that I can think of existed 40 years ago about a block away from where I was born which is half a mile from the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles. This was between Third and Beverly Boulevards and Western and Vermont Streets and was one tremendous swamp which you see is no longer there. This disappeared I would say about 1920, something like that, but not before it had its impact upon me as a boy to become interested in nature. Now, this would be extremely valuable to the City of Los Angeles and to the education of its children if it had been allowed to be preserved, but this went the way of all flesh. This just proves that we need to think ahead and what we need to think about is acquisition rather than development because the development will come along, but you can't develop anything that you don't have any more.

Now, another thing, we have had statistics thrown at us by everyone and many of the commercial interests have said there are so many trailers and so many this and that and the other thing. Statistics available should be examined carefully and certain recreation types involve registration or license and they are pretty easy to count. But these same people have other uses than the ones in which the commercial interests have been exploiting their tally. I think we are not counting properly the average citizen who goes out. He may not have a trailer, he may not have a boat, but he goes to these areas. He enjoys the area to the best of his own pocketbook and yet he is not being counted and considered as much as the fellow that has been able to buy a boat or a trailer, and yet he I think is still definitely in the majority, although we are getting pretty much in the other fashion. But these things I think should be considered in your bill under consideration and see to it that we do what we can to preserve the outdoors as it exists today and existed quite a while ago, but will not exist in say another 10 years. So this is the thing to do.

What has to be done now is land preservation while it is still there in the form in which it should be, naturally, and not in the form of a development in which they demolish a few buildings and all they can put onto it is some artificial recreation area. We need to have a closer approach to nature itself and this is why again I say acquisition in the problem and I might also mention this, that the type of land that I am

indicating is the cheapest land in two ways. Acquisition costs are less because somebody doesn't have a big use for it at the present time; and secondly, the upkeep on this land is at a minimum. You don't have to have the facilities that you do in so many of the other forms so that this is a one-shot deal. You pay for it now. It goes off the tax rolls, but it isn't paying much taxes anyway, but it isn't going to cost very much to keep it going and its need is going to increase many-fold as our population increases. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness?
Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: You mention that even in our local planning that you might acquire property and then decide not to use it and economically it would be a sound investment, that you could always get possibly more than you paid for it under your condemnation?

MR. TYLER: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: That raises the point and has nothing to do with your local problem. It has nothing to do with your local problem, but would you suggest that inasmuch as a very grievous situation transpired in San Francisco along that line, that the property owner whose property is taken by condemnation and then the public agency decides not to use that property, that that property owner has the prior right to buy it back at the price paid by the public agency?

MR. TYLER: I would think that this would be a

very equitable solution to this situation. I think that this is one of the main objections that people have because we have had this sort of thing in the past and right in the Los Angeles area we have had the case of Chavez Ravine. This was to be used for a public agency and then they turned around and went to a private baseball corporation which in this case is well able to support itself.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: In other words, the public agency has no more right to proceed along immoral lines than a private individual?

MR. TYLER: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: In San Francisco they took property away from people for the Diamond Heights Project. They found out that they had taken too much, excess land and improvements, and instead of giving the original property owner who had a sacred right to that property up to the point of condemnation where the public interest came first, they put it to public auction and made a handsome profit at the expense of **those people** who had lost their homes. Now, I wouldn't want Mr. Cameron's bills to get voted down by the people of California if it didn't have that protective clause in it.

MR. TYLER: This I think is very essential to protect those people who were foresighted or lucky enough to have had this property that the State has desired and acquired title to--if they do not use it, there should be a provision so that they can acquire this and at least benefit in some fashion

for their foresight.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: All right, thank you very much. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony, Mr. Tyler. Mr. Williams Frederickson, Jr. Is Mr. Frederickson here? The next witness I want to call is Dr. Frank Harnett. Give your name and position.

DR. HARNETT: Dr. Frank Harnett, president of the Long Beach Trailer Club. Before I speak on this could I speak a word as the associate director of recreation for the City of Long Beach? I want to concur in the statements made by Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Hjelte this morning. I heard them and I think they were very fine and appropriate.

Because of one or two questions asked by the Senators in regard to trailers, I do want to tell you that I represent a club of 212 family trailer members that are not sponsored by anybody. We get together because we like to be together and have been together for some six years now. I began trailing in 1935. The three things we need and we think that the State Park areas can provide these are: 1, a place to have overnight stops as we travel up and down the coast or across the country; 2, a vacation spot in some wooded or park atmosphere where we can spend a week or 10 days with our families to enjoy the park itself; and 3, a place for group meetings or rallies.

As an example, out of our club we have at least 25 to sometimes 67 trailers going on a week-end on a rally or little trip together. As the presidents of these clubs, of which there are

now 75 in the county, we travel around to see who is building a new mobile home park somewhere and just recently we went to Yucaipa because there was a brand-new 78-spot trailer court with only three trailers in it. They were glad to take us on a week-end. We had 29 trailers up there. This is how we get outings, by finding places where they are building a mobile home park, but this is soon filled up. Now, in Huntington State Park you have to get there by 2:00 o'clock to get in, but there you find a place to have overnight stops or to spend a few days to enjoy the scenery. Now, to show my sincerity, Gentlemen, tomorrow night is the annual meeting of the Long Beach Trailer Club. We have as of last night 200 reservations for this meeting. There is a dinner, and if you will come with your wives, you are my personal guests tomorrow night to see what trailerists are. You will meet the people and get to talk with them and see what we do as a trailer club. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness?
Senator Cameron has a question.

SENATOR CAMERON: Would you agree with Mr. Tedder? He thought that if the land is available that a lease or concession to a private operator, the charges would be enough to actually compensate or make the State a little profit?

DR. HARNETT: This is true. We have a parksite in Long Beach where we are thinking about perhaps putting in a small trailer park and we have had offers from two different groups to pay the City of Long Beach 10 percent if we will let

them go in there and develop the park and lease it to them for a period of years. So I believe your statement is true, sir.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Mr. Elmer T. Worthy, please, of Glendale. Be seated and give your name and who you represent for the record, please.

MR. WORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Elmer T. Worthy. I am representing Travel Trailer Clubs of America which started from nothing seven years ago and now has 86 clubs and members in 26 of the various states. Most of our membership, however, is in Southern California. I want to emphasize the fact we have grown from nothing to 3,000 trailer families in seven years' time which shows a tremendous growth and shows where we are in this trailer movement.

Now, there is a big difference between a mobile home and a travel trailer. I'll not take time to explain the difference, but I want to emphasize there is a big difference. The travel trailerist wants a place to go week-ends. When I was a youngster, people wanted to go camping. Now, people are buying trailers. There is a big change in the movement. There are fewer and fewer campers and more and more travel trailers in the ratio relationship, and the travel trailerist is a family situation, too.

In other words, our 3,000 members are family situations. Over half of them are working people with families. Now, with

this tremendous growth I want to emphasize also that although we have 3,000 travel trailer members there are over 100,000 travel trailers in California, so we haven't started yet as far as membership goes, and we wish to represent those people, too, as well, because they have the problems of finding a place to go.

The next thing I want to emphasize is that we have these trailers and then we have no place to go with them. That is one thing that is causing our rapid growth actually in our own organization. They hope to get into a club because it is easier to go places and because a club can find places and take the whole membership out there much easier than somebody can start out in the morning and hope to find a place to stay at night when he gets there. So our whole matter of movement is a matter of reservations. We want to reserve ahead of time so we run into a problem there with our State Parks because the State Parks will not take reservations, so in the summertime we can't go near the beaches because there is no place for us. Once in a while we can go into a State Park in the wintertime but not in the summertime and not during the vacation periods and not during good weather time so that is one of our problems.

Another is, for example, in Los Angeles County, as far as county and city ownership is concerned, there is not one place we can take a trailer, not one place in the county we can go with a club. There is one bright spot and that is Ventura County. They permit trailers in practically all their parks,

so the Los Angeles County Travel Trailer Clubs have been going to Ventura County and we have been paying a fee for that which we are happy to do.

I want to say just a word about one of the previous speakers who was criticizing the trailers. I want to emphasize this, that your trailer is replacing the camper, and the trailer is coming here in large numbers whether we like it or not. They are here now in large numbers and they will be here in much larger numbers in the future than will any other group. So there should be space provided for them.

Now, the last part I want to emphasize is we are willing to pay our way. This morning the question was raised about increased fees for State Parks. We are happy to pay our way and want to emphasize that because we have a lot of money invested in our rigs. We have a family we want to take places and we are not going to quibble over fees. Right now we are forced for the most part as the previous speaker, Dr. Harnett, said, to go into private trailer parks whenever we can find a space and pay their rates which sometimes goes usually from \$2.00 to \$3.50 a night. However, there are only certain times we can get into those private parks and that is when they are first new, when they will take the trailer club in. After they get a few mobile home owners in there, they refuse to take travel trailer clubs in there. Furthermore, they are not located in a recreation area anyway. The mobile parks are located for people who need a place to live. It is a house to live in, a

house on wheels is all. The travel trailer is one that moves around. It goes places and does things, so we want to go with our travel trailers to recreation areas and what we want when we get to those recreation areas is to find a place where we can sit down with our family and take part in recreation and associated activities. I thank you for the privilege of talking to you.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any questions of this witness? Thank you very much. We appreciate having you here and having your testimony. Mr. Alexander Deutsch. Sit down and give your name and your official position and who you represent for the record, please, Mr. Deutsch.

MR. DEUTSCH: My name is Alexander Deutsch. I might represent two or three or four hundred thousand skiers, but officially I don't represent anybody. I'm not even interested in speaking about anything that leads to a profit for me. I'm strictly here on public interests. Since this is a Fact-Finding Committee on Natural Resources, my interest is recreation as pertains to natural resources. For the past year I have made quite a study of our primitive areas, our wilderness area and our National forest as pertains to San Geronimo, which is in our back yard here.

Now, the principal recreation of Southern Californians or all Californians in the wintertime is snow play. It isn't nearly as popular as summer swimming, but for the wintertime it

is the number 1 deal. Last winter in the Southern California area we didn't have one single solitary day of skiing and probably not over three or four days of any type of snow play. The popularity of recreational skiing and recreational snow play in Southern California was evidenced when we had an early snow storm in our local mountains. If you are familiar with Southern California, you will know that in the San Bernardino Mountains to come down from what we will call snow summit to snow valley took two hours on Thanksgiving. The road leading into Mt. Baldy, which is another recreational area when they are lucky enough to have snow, the traffic was stopped in the afternoon preventing any further cars going in there, there was such a traffic jam. This certainly shows a public interest in snow play purposes.

Now, the reason I am here is that we have an area in Southern California comparable to the great snow areas of the western United States. I'll have to explain this. You may know or you may not know it, but the snow areas where there is active snow play are all above 8500 feet. Aspen, Colorado; Mammoth, California; Alta, Utah, those areas are all about 8500 feet. In desperation, certain facility owners in Southern California have put in such things as ski lifts below 8,000 feet. This is below the so-called winter snow belt. Our winter snow belt is above 8,000 feet. Everything I'm saying I can substantiate right here in my briefcase. I have a letter here which shows that on December 6th in the San Bernardino Mountains

where they were skiing this year they had more skiing already this year than they had all of last year, and they were skiing on from 6 inches to 18 inches of snow. If you were to tell anybody in Switzerland or Aspen or Alta or even Mammoth of someone skiing on 6 inches of snow, it would be quite laughable. We ski on 6 inches here and it is dangerous, but we ski on it in desperation.

In the meantime, if you go atop of the lift at snow summit you look over the horizon and here is an abundance of snow. It is closer, actually much closer than snow summit, and it is covered with snow. I have a picture here taken last April, the 13th, if anyone wants to see it. My son went up in an airplane and took a shot showing snow summit completely bare, and not one speck of snow on it, and showing snow areas that were skiable on San Geronio right in back of it. This was April 13 or April 12 of last year. I took moving pictures if anyone should question this, I took moving pictures if anyone should question this, I took moving pictures on the same day and I can show you pictures where there was up to 3 feet of snow. Now, every year, and the Forestry Department will not contest this, every year there is an abundance of snow in San Geronio and it is the quality of snow that people like for snow play. They don't like mushy snow, wet snow, they don't like crusty snow. If any of you ski, you know the difference. If kids play in the snow you know the difference.

We have this perfect ski area in Southern California

which is less than 2 and a half hours from right here. Anyone that wanted to ski last year had to drive clear up to Mammoth, spend 13 hours driving back and forth, if they are willing to break the speed laws like I have done to make the trip in 13 hours. They could have gone to San Geronimo and down in five hours round trip.

SENATOR ARNOLD: What is your elevation at Mammoth?

MR. DEUTSCH: Mammoth, the bottom of the lift is 8500 feet. It goes up as high as 11,000 to the top of Mammoth Peak. And San Geronimo is the highest mountain in Southern California, 11,500 feet. There are two other areas that are over 8500 feet. One is San Antonio and the other is San Jacinto. San Antonio is like a big rock and Mt. Baldy is too steep to go up there. They go up there but they can fall down and they are through. They do that quite often. San Jacinto is a beautiful area, but it is very rocky and it would be impossible to have adequate snow play.

SENATOR CAMERON: I thought I skied on San Geronimo.. Is this from Bear Lake that way?

MR. DEUTSCH: Did you hike up?

SENATOR CAMERON: Yes, it took all day to go up and a short time to come down. I didn't go to the top, incidentally.

MR. DEUTSCH: You are right. We go up there in the wintertime, but there isn't one in a thousand that can do it. It is too rugged. We are planning a trip. We'll get off

the highway, go to what is known as Poopout Hill and we will hike and then camp overnight because you get off that below 8,000 feet and hike up to 8500, 9,000 feet to where you want to ski. Yes, they do that. They hold races there every year, but it is only the hardest. Your children wouldn't go in and your parents wouldn't go in.

SENATOR CAMERON: Who owns that?

MR. DEUTSCH: It is owned by the Forestry Department. It is owned by the United States Government. The Forestry Department has taken a strong title to it though and they are claiming it as a wilderness area, which it is. Now, I would like--I know you are all anxious to get out of here. I will go to point 2. There is the Wilderness Bill which I haven't found very many people that know what it is. The Wilderness Bill states unequivocally that we are going to close all wilderness areas, that you fellows will never be able to encroach on them, and furthermore we are going to take primitive areas away from you and lock it up so that you can never get in there again. Now, this is the Wilderness Bill. I have it here if any of you want to read it. It states this positively and they are trying to railroad this thing through Congress right now ahead of the Recreation Act which I hope someone here is familiar with--pardon me, the Recreation Bill in which Uncle Sam appropriated approximately 2 and a half million dollars to make a study of recreation facilities. Now, the report is not due yet. It is due in the Congress in 1962 and they are going to try to run

the Wilderness Bill through the House of Representatives. It has already passed the Senate. They are going to try to run it through the House of Representatives before the recreation research comes in because obviously it will point out defects in the Wilderness Bill.

SENATOR ARNOLD: I carried a resolution, sir, in the 1960 session memorializing Congress to postpone anything on the Wilderness Bill until your recreation report is in.

MR. DEUTSCH: But it didn't pass.

SENATOR ARNOLD: This was a resolution of the California Legislature.

MR. DEUTSCH: Well, I meant--I don't want to be name-dropping, but I met with Senator Morse last week of the State of Oregon and they are doing the identical thing that I am trying to do here. They have taken the White Cascade area and by the way, with Senator Morse and a few Republicans and Democrats they forced into the Wilderness Bill the part that says the Secretary will make a study and make whatever changes are necessary on primitive areas and they will give them 15 years to make this study, but once they turn the recommendation in and it is accepted, then you have to go through the President of the United States, have it ratified by Congress to make a change, but this doesn't protect the wilderness area. It doesn't protect the wilderness areas against the wilderness people who are trying to lock this up. By the way, one section of the State of California is in forest lands and they are going

to try to lock up as much as they can. There are also 14 million acres of wild or wilderness area in the United States. Now, this does not include primitive areas. There is at least an equal or bigger amount of primitive areas and I hope you know what the difference is.

Now, what I'm driving at here, I never made a study of this Committee, I have never approached anybody on a local or State level except I am trying to get through to Governor Brown, and haven't been very successful. What I'm trying to say here is that we in Southern California--every week there are 4 or 5,000 people here that travel out of Southern California to go into a skiing area normally. We have the area in our back yard. I have talked to the Secretary of Agriculture and I have talked to our own Senators, not Senators, a Senator, and I know that this area can be made available for a State Park or for a county park. I don't know through what mechanical setup it would be, and it would be a low-cost project to give tremendous benefit to the community of Southern California. There just isn't any question about it.

There are other things too. You brought up the question of heights. You cannot ski, you cannot guarantee snow play below 8500 feet anywhere in the west. It is not in the cards. You take Squaw Valley--

SENATOR CAMERON: I would appreciate it if you didn't bring that subject up.

MR. DEUTSCH: You take Squaw Valley, you have to

go on the lift way up to get to the ski area unless the snow is excellent and even if they have snow on the ground it becomes crusty or slushy in the bottom area. It is a mistake to put a snow play area below certainly 8,000 feet.

I have pictures here. Everything I have said I can back up. I only hope--I don't know what the purpose of this Committee is, and I saw the clipping in the newspaper where you are spending all this money and thought that if you would take a few million out of this and I know that San Bernardino County and Riverside County and Los Angeles County would be tickled to death to spend the money if we could get some help in getting this area opened up, and if you were going to spend the money, certainly for winter sports there would be no place--in fact, in discussing with other skiers, there isn't any place anywhere in the United States near a population center like Southern California that has a snow area as good as we have in Southern California, and yet no one was able to get in there and use it last year when there wasn't any snow any place else. This year it is impossible to get to. I have a letter here from the forester in San Bernardino who told me what the depth was 500 feet below the ski area. You couldn't trudge your way in there. Right now you have to wait until--I don't say you would have to. If you are real strong, you might be able to get up there, but otherwise like two years ago when we had snow, the Alpine Ski Club planned to meet there in April, but there was 4 feet of snow and it was impossible to get to and they had to postpone

it until May. But there wasn't any skiing anywhere else in Southern California at that date.

SENATOR QUICK: May I ask a question, please? How often do you have snow on that mountain in April?

MR. DEUTSCH: You don't have many--very seldom do you have snow in April.

SENATOR QUICK: How often? You keep talking about April.

MR. DEUTSCH: Well, you don't have snow, but the snow is already there. It doesn't melt.

SENATOR QUICK: How often is it already there in April?

MR. DEUTSCH: Every year.

SENATOR QUICK: Every year?

MR. DEUTSCH: Every year. I have the pictures here.

SENATOR QUICK: How about San Jacinto?

MR. DEUTSCH: I can't vouch for San Jacinto. San Jacinto is across the little desert and there does not seem to be in my opinion as much snow at San Jacinto, not nearly as much.

SENATOR QUICK: What is the elevation of San Jacinto?

MR. DEUTSCH: 10,870 feet at the top. San Geronio is 11,501. The ski area that I and others have agreed upon is from 8500 to 10,500 leaving 1,000 feet available for

hikers without any interference.

SENATOR QUICK: What do you do with this area when there isn't snow on it? What would it be good for then?

MR. DEUTSCH: In the winter time?

SENATOR QUICK: No, when there was no snow.

MR. DEUTSCH: The same as now, nothing. I'll read you if you want me to in here, it says this is the most populated hiking area in the State of California. It says so here by the Forestry Department. However, I believe it is an untruth.

SENATOR QUICK: Let's don't read it then.

MR. DEUTSCH: But it says so. Now, there are in the Barton Flats area down below, there are camps, Boy Scout camps and all kinds of little things, but I would say that in the summer time to make this area--I would love to say there is a beautiful lake and there would be boating, but there isn't. There are two little lakes, one called Dry Lake and it is apropos. It could be used for ice skating in the winter and the other is called Dollar Lake. It is a little lake of water, but too small for any play purposes.

SENATOR QUICK: In other words, it isn't a year-round recreation?

MR. DEUTSCH: I can't answer that because I'm only qualified I think to speak about winter sports and it is used now in the summer time. That is why they say this is the greatest area in Southern California, but it is for hikers. It

is a hiking area like anything else in Southern California.
By the way, if you want--

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions?

SENATOR ARNOLD: I have a question. Mr. Deutsch, Mammoth Lake is operated by the United States Forest Service, is it not?

MR. DEUTSCH: It is operated--Mammoth Lake? I couldn't tell you about the lakes, but Mammoth ski area--

SENATOR ARNOLD: That is what I mean, the ski area.

MR. DEUTSCH: Mammoth ski area is operated by David McCoy who operates under the license I believe of the United States Forestry Service.

SENATOR ARNOLD: And the areas you speak of are also in the United States National Forest, are they not?

MR. DEUTSCH: It is in wild area of the United States National Forest, not wilderness.

SENATOR ARNOLD: My thought was it is properly a project for the Federal Forestry Service to develop, and I think that is the area you would want.

MR. DEUTSCH: The Federal Forestry, and I'll quote, has little or not interest in the people of Southern California any more than they do in the people of Florida, and I'm quoting now, they consider the ownership of the forest to belong to the people of the 50 states in the United States, and the person in Alaska or Florida or the little lady from Brooklyn have as much interest, as much ownership in the National

Forest as anyone living here in California despite the fact that they may never come here or they may never use it. Now, this is what they call public interest in the National Forest. The National Forestry Department does not have any interest in the State Parks or in our natural resources for the State or for the local community and you have to come in on that end of it, not the Federal government. They don't have an interest.

SENATOR ARNOLD: No, but I'm speaking about Mammoth Lakes.

MR. DEUTSCH: Mammoth Mountains?

SENATOR ARNOLD: Well, the ski area of Mammoth Mountain. They have done that in other parts of the country.

MR. DEUTSCH: Name it.

SENATOR CAMERON: Squaw Valley.

MR. DEUTSCH: Was Squaw Valley a primitive area or a forest?

SENATOR CAMERON: It is there.

MR. DEUTSCH: I believe Squaw Valley was a primitive area.

SENATOR CAMERON: I don't know what it is, but before the State was interested they had given ski concessions. Part of the land was private, but the peaks--

MR. DEUTSCH: You can be sure there was a tremendous effort on the part of certain citizens to get it done. I don't think you gentlemen quite understand one thing. We have wild areas which is an acreage of 5,000 to 100,000. San Geronio

is 35,000 acres. This is wild area. This is unimportant to the Forestry Department for some reason. It is really just the same. The wilderness is 100,000 and over. Then you have primitive areas. Now, the basic difference is this. In wilderness you must not set foot in there with any vehicle including a helicopter, airplane or bicycle, automobile or anything. You must not put a road into it. Now, the primitive areas, you can have automobiles and roads and everything in there with permission. There wouldn't be any problem in San Geronimo if it were a primitive area because you could build a road into it. Instead of hiking up to ski you could drive in and ski assuming they didn't permit you to have lifts. In a wilderness area you can't get to it. When they take this Wilderness Bill, if it goes through and the Secretary of Agriculture said it would go through, not that I wanted it, but he said it would, when they take your big areas back here in the High Sierras that are now primitive and they make them wilderness areas, and if it is 10 miles in depth to penetrate and you can only go 2 miles a day and it takes 5 miles to go into it, no one unless they can hike for 5 miles or get on a pack horse will ever see that area. It is closed forever. And it takes 20 days, it is the same thing. You will never be able to get in there.

SENATOR ARNOLD: I'm looking at this thing from a practical standpoint. Aren't you a little optimistic in thinking the Federal government would take a different attitude toward the State of California if you were to succeed in interesting

the Division of Beaches and Parks in establishing a ski area there?

MR. DEUTSCH: Absolutely they would. All you gave to do is to get the Governor and the two Senators in that State interested in this and they will walk into the Agricultural Department who will then have a hearing on it. The hearing will be held and if the Secretary of Agriculture has got enough influence behind him, he will pass it as a ski area and it will not--I'm one person and it will not go through through my efforts alone and for your information I'm sure that we have one of the Senators interested in getting this thing opened because there will be half a million people conservatively, and once again it is in the document, the Forestry Department says right off the bat there will be a hundred to one more people that will visit this than if it is made into a wilderness. They are wrong, it is a thousand to one. There will be 500,000 people every winter minimum that will go in there. There is half that amount that go 365 miles to Mammoth from Los Angeles, so it would be easy to consider it doubled.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Any other questions? Thank you very much, we appreciate having you here and having your testimony.

MR. DEUTSCH: Thank you for letting me talk. I hope I didn't get off the course here. I don't really know what the main purpose of the meeting is.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: I would like to ask a question.

Have you interceded with your Congressman and United States Senator?

MR. DEUTSCH: I have a letter here from Senator Engle and I'm going to meet with him. He is interested in the project, yes, but this isn't enough. We have to have you people and we have to have the State behind it.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: In the wilderness area you are not allowed to have any traffic at all?

MR. DEUTSCH: None at all.

ASSEMBLYMAN GAFFNEY: Nothing but shank's mare is the only means of locomotion?

MR. DEUTSCH: That is right.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

MR. DEUTSCH: Thanks for letting me be heard.

CHAIRMAN WILLIAMS: On December 13th, which is day after tomorrow at 10:00, A.M., this Committee will meet in room 1194 in the State Building Annex in San Francisco. I would like to thank those people who participated at our hearing today and those who sat through the day. I would also like to thank Mrs. Davis and Mr. Gaffney who sat here with us and who are from the Assembly Ways and Means Committee. Senator Sturgeon, I want to recognize you again from San Luis Obispo County. We are happy to have you seated with the Committee. On that basis we have finished our agenda and we are going to adjourn in the memory of Senator Jack Hollister who was a member of the Committee and passed away prior to Thanksgiving Day. With

that the meeting will stand in adjournment. We will see you all in San Francisco day after tomorrow at 10:00, A.M.

(The following statement is included in the record at the request of the Chairman:)

SENATE HEARING ON STATE ~~PARK~~ BOND ISSUE

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Statement of S. W. Bridgers, President,
California Council of Landscape Architects

12/11/61

Senator Williams and Members of the Committee:

I am here representing the California Council of Landscape Architects, an organization composed of the several groups of landscape architects in the State of California, to urge that you recommend initiation of a bond issue for acquisition of more land for recreational development in California.

Most existing park facilities, particularly those closer to major urban areas, are already overcrowded. Population growth will cause even more need for recreational facilities as time goes on. Land must be obtained at the first opportunity, therefore, to assure a reasonable provision for recreational needs of the surging population. Land for this purpose will be lost for all time in many locations ideally suited for recreation if steps are not taken immediately. Delay in getting land, now can result in higher costs to the citizens of the State to the point where it would become unfeasible economically.

Preservation of open space and creation of adequate facilities for recreation is not unique to the State of California.

The American Society of Landscape Architects, is very concerned that proper planning and action be taken by every state. California, being a prime recreational area for the nation, having been endowed with many assets and beauties of nature attractive to tourists from all over the world, and experiencing one of the greatest population growth rates of all of the states, is faced, quite properly, with the responsibility to consider and act seriously and promptly to fulfill its obligations to the people.

I would like to read a statement of policy issued by the Trustees of the American Society of Landscape Architects which expresses this concern.

Read Policy No. 30 - A.S.L.A.

The California Council of Landscape Architects has been aware for some time of the growing need for funds to acquire added recreational land before it is too late, and to implement planning and construction of new recreational areas to keep pace with the growing need. Of equal concern to us is the preservation of open spaces within fast-growing urban areas to create adequate relief from the built-in tension-creators typical of the big city. Most communities today are struggling with means for financing the facilities and services needed to satisfy every-day needs of sanitation, policing, streets, etc., many of an emergency nature, and are not in a position today to make provision for acquiring or placing in reserve land for recreation and open space. The State should assist in this

long-range goal as it does in other ways to support communities and regions in objectives which are beyond their means.

The Council would like to commend the committee for its interest in implementing funds for recreational facility expansion. It urges again that you make a strong recommendation to place a bond issue on the next ballot, sufficient in scope to fulfill this very vital obligation to the citizens of California. Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this hearing.

(The following statement is included in the record at the request of the Chairman:)

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
San Bernardino, California

Statement of the Board of Supervisors
San Bernardino County

SUBJECT: State Legislative Bill Stipulating \$150,000,000 Bond Issue to Finance Acquisition and Development of State Parks

A. San Bernardino County is aware of the tremendous growth in the demand for outdoor recreational improvements in recent years.

1. The attendance within the San Bernardino National Forest has more than tripled since 1945. Nearly 8,000,000 visitor-days were counted in 1959. This is about 25% of total attendance in all State Parks in 1960. Most of this attendance originates in the Los Angeles Metropolitan area.

2. There has been a comparable growth in attendance along the Colorado River in the County. 90% of these visitors make the long drive to the river from the Los Angeles Basin.

3. Increase in traffic counts indicate that more and more

city dwellers have learned to enjoy a fine recreational experience in the arid back country of San Bernardino County.

4. The demand for park development of regional size and quality in the Santa Ana River valley portion of the county have also increased to the point where the existing facilities are deteriorating from excessive use.

B. The County does not at present operate a Department of Recreation but since 1957, much planning has been done in anticipation of a time in the near future when such a department would be established.

1. Made studies and recommended certain locations in the County to be considered for inclusion in the State Park System.

2. Participated in the Inter-County Recreation Planning Study, the California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan and the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review.

3. Conducted independent studies analyzing the recreation potential of the Colorado River frontage in the County. As a result, the County is improving 140 acres of river front as a marina, near Topock.

4. Requested reservation of some 200,000 acres of public domain for recreational use through the Bureau of Land Management and applied for immediate purchase of about 2,000 acres under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

5. Initiated a 1,750 acre recreational development in

the Prado Basin through the Army Corps of Engineers. The County is of the opinion that certain water conservation and flood control lands can and should be used for recreational activities wherever feasible to do so.

6. Implemented a modest roadside park program to provide rest stops on some County maintained roads. There are now nine such facilities in existence; two are under construction.

C. The inquiries made by San Bernardino County show: that numerous excellent regional park sites exist within its boundaries; that, the use of the existing facilities is, in the main, from sources other than residents of the County; that, except for a small State Park at Mitchell's Cavern, the State has not implemented any other project within the County to assist in satisfying the known regional demand.

D. In view of the present and future need for regional parks to satisfy the heavy day use demand generated in the metropolitan areas, the County will endorse a bill stipulating a bond issue of \$150,000,000 provided the bill specifically reserves to the separate counties a share of such funds for the acquisition and development of regional parks to be administered by the Counties themselves; the share to the counties to be determined by some acceptable method which would take into account the demand potential, the distance of site from the source of demand and the number of such regional park opportunities in the County.

/s/ Paul J. Young, Chairman
Board of Supervisors.

(The following communication is included in the record
at the request of the Chairman:)

To: The Senate Fact Finding Committee
On Natural Resources
California Legislature

From: The Del Norte County Chamber of Commerce

Subject: Senate Bill No. 602, Senate Constitutional Amendment
No. 15, and Senate Bill No. 1409.

1. Because of the extremely short notice of the scheduled hearings on the above pieces of legislation, this chamber is unable to prepare extensive material or to appear before the committee. It does desire, however, that the following statements be presented and made a part of the record of these hearings:

(a) Senate Bill No. 1409

No comment.

(b) Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 15

This chamber is opposed to such bond issue if funds are to be administered under terms of Senate Bill No. 602 as now written.

This chamber will not oppose the bond issue if administered under terms of the suggested changes in Senate Bill No. 602, following.

(c) Senate Bill No. 602.

Objections and recommendations.

5095.4 - - We object to the proposed conditions for expenditures.

5095.5 - - We submit that at least equal sums be

designated for development and for acquisition. For example, at the minimum, the section should provide "not more than \$36,000,000.00 shall be expended for acquisition and at least \$36,000,000.00 shall be expended for development".

We would further favor a ratio of 40% for acquisition and 60% for development.

5095.6 - - We object to the proposed "north-south" division as outlined, and submit that the formula should read "not more than 25% shall be expended in the Counties of San Luis Obispo, Tulare, Inyo, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside, San Diego and Imperial, and at least 70% shall be expended in the remaining counties".

(d) Senate Bill No. 602.

Comment, Chapters 5095.5 and 5095.6.

We submit that further excessive expenditures for acquisition without concurrent development does not serve the best interests of the people of the state because it ignores needs that currently exist. The state holds now, and has for many years, held vast acreages of land of high scenic and recreational quality that are still totally undeveloped.

In Del Norte County alone, the State holds 15,000 acres of high quality redwood park lands, only 100 acres of which are developed, and 90% of which are inaccessible even for sightseeing or foot-trail visiting. In this county also, approximately 50% of those wishing to camp overnight are turned away from the only available area for lack of space. 52% of these

are people from Southern California, principally Los Angeles County. We refer the committee to the records of Jedediah Smith State Park.

We submit that the State cannot afford to let these high quality sites remain idle while it spends more money to acquire more land which will in turn remain idle due to lack of funds for development.

Regarding the "north-south" division of funds, we submit that although the majority of people live in the south, the majority of high quality, low-priced recreation land lies in the north, and that the people of the south do, and will, by preference travel of their own accord to the more desirable and less crowded areas of mountains, lakes, timber, and sea shore in the north.

Expending a preponderance of money for recreational sites in the southern counties where size quality is lowest and land price highest will give the state and its people (including residents of southern counties) the least for their investment. We therefore submit that the greater percentage of funds both for acquisition and development should be designated (by formula) under Chapter 5095.5 for expenditure in the "north". We further submit that the formula should designate a fixed percentage of not less than 25% for development of those lands now held.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Harry Trehearne, President, Del Norte County Chamber
of Commerce
/s/ Charles A. Thielen, Chairman, Public Parks & Lands
Committee.

WESTERN COUNCIL OF TRAILER CLUBS
4241 E. Live Oak Ave., C 7
Arcadia, California

December 13, 1961

Honorable J. Howard Williams, Chairman
Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources
State Capitol, Sacramento, California

Dear Senator Williams:

I was one of those appearing before your committee in Los Angeles, Dec. 11. A written statement was presented which was endorsed by Trailer Coach Association of Los Angeles.

Unfortunately, I neglected to state orally that this endorsement existed. I wish to insure that this endorsement is included in the transcript of that meeting and ask that you ask the recorder to include such a statement in the permanent record.

Mr. David Lyon, Trailer Coach Association, 607 S. Hobart Blvd., Los Angeles 5, Calif. extends regrets that he was unable to attend. A Planning Department hearing on the same date prevented his attendance.

I wish to commend your committee on the thoroughness with which the subject of park development and the Park Bond Issue was pursued.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Joel Tedder, Chairman
Western Council of Trailer Clubs.

Some months ago the Oceano Beach Improvement Association passed as resolution, copy of which was sent to the Chairman of the above-mentioned committee, which stated that we could not support a Bond Issue of the character proposed unless it contained a mandatory provision that at least 50% of the money be allocated to development, to be expended concurrently with the similar amount for acquisition.

This action was taken because our members have for several years past seen hundreds of vacationers who desired either trailer or camp sites turned away from the Pismo Beach State Park each summer for lack of accommodations.

This was not for a lack of land as the Division of Beaches and Parks already has purchased, condemned or has had approved for purchase approximately one thousand acres of land (1000 acres) and of this amount there is sufficient level, accessible land of no scenic value in this State Park to double, treble or perhaps more than quadruple the number of presently available trailer and camp sites.

Experience of our members who have tried to secure such accommodations in other State Parks indicates that this same condition prevails quite generally throughout the State Park system.

From Sacramento's "ivory towers" of government there is naturally, and properly, an excellent perspective of the possible needs of future generations.

We, who are turned away from one state park after another, and who see hundreds of others subjected to the same treatment have

a more realistic view of the needs of the present generation.

We believe that due consideration should be given to future generations but we also believe that the present generation is entitled to equal consideration.

Furthermore, we believe that such a bond issue cannot pass unless it has the support of people who want a place to park their trailer or camp next summer, and of the labor unions who will benefit from the work which development provides.

We believe it will also need the support of the various Boards of County Supervisors, who will be loath to see property removed from county assessment rolls unless there is some compensating return in the form of employment, material sales and sales tax.

In the interest of a balanced economy we urge that you recommend a 50/50 division of funds between acquisition and development, to be spent concurrently.

Charles Anders, Vice President

Oceano Improvement Association

(Formerly Oceano Beach Improvement Association.)

(Whereupon the hearing was adjourned.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

---oOo---

This is to certify that I, ALICE BOOK, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, was present at the time and place the foregoing proceedings were heard before the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources in Room 1138 State Building, Los Angeles, California, Monday, December 11, 1961, and that as such Reporter I did take down the said proceedings in shorthand writing, and that thereafter I caused the shorthand writing to be transcribed into longhand typewriting, and that the foregoing pages beginning at the top of page 1 to and including page 172 hereof, constitute a true, complete, accurate and correct transcription of the aforementioned shorthand writing.

Dated this 4th day of January, 1962.

Certified Shorthand Reporter

---oOo---